



AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION®
POLICIES FOR 2009

SECTION 2 - FARM POLICY / TRADE

COMMODITIES

- 201 Apple Industry
- 202 Cotton
- 203 Honey and Apiculture
- 204 Maple
- 205 Peanuts
- 206 Soybeans and Other Oilseeds
- 207 Sugar
- 208 Table Wine
- 209 Tobacco

FARM POLICY/FARM PROGRAMS

- 225 Alternative Farming Methods
- 226 Conservation Reserve Program
- 227 Environmental Management Systems
- 228 National Conservation and Environmental Policy
- 229 National Dairy Program
- 230 National Farm Policy
- 231 Sustainable Agriculture
- 232 Wetlands Reserve Program

TRADE / TREATIES

- 245 Agricultural Exports
- 246 Agricultural Imports
- 247 Foreign Aid
- 248 Global Environmental Agreements and Treaties
- 249 International Trade
- 250 Trade Negotiations
- 251 U.S. Border Regulations
- 252 United Nations

COMMODITIES

Apple Industry 201

Emphasis should be placed on assisting the apple industry to remain economically viable by:

- (1) Challenging agricultural researchers to increase work aimed at enhancing profitability;
- (2) Expanding efforts to explore market opportunities to apple growers in the face of increasing costs of production coupled with steady and declining prices; and
- (3) Addressing disadvantages to U.S. producers that have been created through trade agreements and trade policy, and that are providing unfair advantages to foreign competitors in both our domestic and foreign markets, especially in the area of apple juice concentrate.

The dumping of apple juice concentrate in the United States market and the slowness of domestic remedies to deal with these illegal imports has caused substantial economic losses to apple growers.

We support:

- (1) Market loss assistance with full eligibility for all growers; and
- (2) Continued funding of fire blight and post-harvest apple research.

Crop insurance has not proven to be a viable tool to compensate for the loss of trees due to fireblight and other natural disasters. Until such time that adequate tree insurance coverage is available, we support the continuation of the permanent, annually funded tree assistance program.

Cotton 202

We support instrument classing of cotton and urge the continued development, improvement and further refinement of cotton classing equipment and procedures.

The classer assignment of color should be eliminated and high volume instrument (HVI) color should be adopted as the official color grade.

We favor producers continuing to have the option to have cotton HVI classed by module/trailer averaging or individual bale.

We recommend that cotton grade standards be re-evaluated to assure that these standards accurately reflect the value of cotton, with special emphasis given to low micronaire and other grade discounts.

We favor the monitoring of "cotton flow" rules and oppose any changes that would penalize the producer.

We support the cotton research and promotion program.

We oppose a reserve program for cotton.

We encourage the cotton division of USDA's Agricultural Marketing Services to make the cotton classification information available to farmers electronically while retaining its identity and privacy. We urge classing offices to maintain its emphasis on timely, accurate and cost-effective service.

We support full funding of the Boll Weevil Eradication Program (BWEP).

The Farm Service Agency (FSA) should continue to collect funds (under state authority), certify cotton acreage, assist in conducting referendums and make farm maps available for the boll weevil eradication programs.

We urge the secretary of agriculture to expedite the availability of appropriated low interest revolving funds that are used to facilitate the expansion of the boll weevil eradication programs.

We encourage continued monitoring of the Step 3 competitiveness program. We support technical changes to Step 3 competitiveness provisions which would limit foreign imports of cotton during times when domestic prices of cotton are at relatively low levels.

We urge the secretary of agriculture to appoint an advisory committee to study the daily spot market quotations for the purpose of developing a mechanism for discovering the true value of quality differences at the producer level.

We support allowing cotton to be grown for education and agritourism as long as it is under BWEP supervision.

We encourage research to minimize shrinkage problems with cotton products.

We recommend research to remove all the gossypol acid from cottonseed and its by-products.

We recommend a replant rider provision be added for cotton under Federal Crop Insurance as is for other crops.

Honey and Apiculture 203

We support:

- (1) The current honey loan program;
- (2) Development of a standard of identity for honey in the United States;
- (3) Congress continuing to adequately fund regionally-located Agricultural Research Service honey bee research centers;
- (4) Funding for research to find practical, effective methods to control or reduce infection of varroa mites, tracheal mites and small hive beetles, Colony Collapse Disorder; and
- (5) Vigorous research and development programs at the federal and state level to evaluate and register effective compounds and management techniques to enable beekeepers to have alternative control strategies and materials.

We oppose imported honey being blended with domestic honey and marketed as a domestic product.

We recommend that national wildlife refuges and parks allow honey bees to be placed within the parks and refuges where appropriate.

Maple 204

We support continuation of economical testing to detect adulteration of pure maple products.

We urge reinstatement at federal forest laboratories of projects toward the development of maple stock with higher sugar content and techniques for control of damaging insects and fungus root rot diseases.

We support an aggressive national and state effort to halt the spread of non-native pathogens and pests which endanger agricultural production, such as the Asian Long Horned Beetle (ALB), a deadly threat to maple trees. Measures specific to ALB should include:

- (1) A ban on untreated wood products and packing materials from China and other countries with known populations of ALBs;
- (2) Monitoring of all imported wood products;

- (3) Funding of research on methods to halt the spread of ALBs; and
- (4) Creating an information hotline for ALBs so sightings can be promptly reported to USDA.

We feel the U.S. Forest Service should reduce the required application process to 90 days for utilizing public forest land and waive the requirement for an environmental impact study and the cost of a public hearing. Per tap cost should reflect regional market conditions.

Peanuts 205

We support the efforts of growers and USDA to develop expanded export markets for peanuts.

We oppose creation of free trade zones for peanuts which would allow peanut kernels and in-shell peanuts to be imported into the United States in excess of limits set forth in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the North American Free Trade Agreement.

We urge USDA to implement a transparent formula for calculating the loan repayment rate for peanuts with attention given to establishing a market clearing world market price to protect and increase export markets.

We recommend the base grade on farmer stock peanuts be 71 on runner peanuts.

We recommend that several very useful tools of the previous peanut program be reinstated because of their significant benefit to all segments of the industry -- namely the peanut marketing smart card, the farm ID cards, and the ability to deduct the state and federally mandated checkoff dollars from peanuts placed under loan.

We oppose differentiation of peanut loan rates based on type.

We recommend that any peanuts forfeited to the Commodity Credit Corporation, after the expiration of the nine months maturity of the loan, be offered for disposition only for crushing and not for edible use.

We oppose Farm Service Agency charging a service fee for handling warehouse receipts for peanuts placed under loan.

Soybeans and Other Oilseeds 206

We support:

- (1) National programs for domestically produced soybeans, oilseeds and related product promotion and research; and
- (2) Increased efforts to speed the release of varieties resistant to Asian Soybean Rust.

Sugar 207

We support:

- (1) A program to protect the interests of domestic sugar producers and recommend that any appropriate legislation should include a sugar title with provisions that ensure a strong and economically viable domestic sugar industry;
- (2) Retention of the current loan rate as a minimum;
- (3) Elimination of the marketing assessment fee(s) or loan forfeiture penalties; and
- (4) Increased research and development funding for biobased energy and biobased products utilizing sugar crops.

Table Wine 208

We support allowing farm wineries to:

- (1) Sell wine on premises;
- (2) Sell, deliver and ship wine directly to consumers off premises in any state, subject to a state's minimum legal age requirements; and
- (3) Sell, deliver and ship wine directly to retail stores and restaurants.

Tobacco 209

We support tobacco production solutions which protect the growers.

We support the maintenance of an active USDA Tobacco Advisory or similiar committee representing the tobacco industry to address the new issues facing growers.

We are opposed to the federal lawsuit brought by the Department of Justice against the tobacco manufacturers/companies.

We support continuation of crop insurance for tobacco.

We support establishment of procedures to prevent biotech tobacco from being commingled with traditional tobacco.

We support legislation allowing states to retain 100 percent of their master settlement agreement dollars and we encourage every state Farm Bureau to pursue 50 percent of their respective state(s) funds for strengthening their agricultural economy.

We support strict enforcement of state laws which prohibit the sale of tobacco products to minors.

The tobacco industry continues to be attacked by anti-tobacco activists and developments of government oversight may present the need for Food and Drug Administration involvement, which if necessary should be confined to processing and distribution.

We support USDA collecting data and issuing reports on tobacco acreage, production and prices received by tobacco type.

Tobacco growers will continue to need tobacco grower co-ops.

We support exploring the possibility of establishing a national check-off for U.S. tobacco export promotion.

We support legislation to eliminate imported tobacco from being exported as U.S. tobacco.

FARM POLICY / FARM PROGRAMS

Alternative Farming Methods 225

We support methods of farming that result in:

- (1) A profit for the farm operator;
- (2) A clean environment; and
- (3) An adequate supply of high quality safe food, feed, fiber and fuel.

We are keenly aware that the means to accomplish these ends may vary from farm operation to farm operation and that no single method of farming will work with every operator.

We support:

- (1) Research aimed at reducing overall inputs needed to sustain a profitable farming operation; and

(2) Efforts to provide information to farmers on proven means of improving the efficiency of inputs.

We oppose:

(1) Any attempt to mandate low input methods of farming; and

(2) Requiring low input methods as a condition of participation in government farm programs.

Conservation Reserve Program 226

We support the continuation of the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and the continuous Conservation Reserve Program. Tenant farmers' rights must be protected. Reasonable limits on participation should be included to protect the economic stability of individual counties or regions. Highly erodible land producing all crops should be eligible for enrollment in CRP.

Land that is not environmentally sensitive enough to be placed in the CRP should not be required to have a conservation compliance plan. Land enrolled in CRP should be limited to only those site-specific locations in critical need of conservation measures, such as highly erodible land. In regions where working land conservation programs are better for the rural economy, general whole farm enrollments should be eliminated unless all acres on the farm meet the local criteria for conservation measures. We favor targeted acreage signups that provide enhanced environmental protection, conservation and renewed economic opportunities in these areas.

We oppose producers being eligible to participate in the CRP who break up fragile land (sodbust) after the CRP contract has been accepted by USDA.

We recommend mandatory control of noxious weeds by local and site specific measures on CRP and Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) lands.

We oppose requirements to destroy existing cover on CRP acres and reseed with other species in order to qualify for re-entry into the program.

To protect CRP and adjacent land, we support a fire protection plan appropriate for each state be included in all present and future CRP contracts.

We recommend that if CRP payments are reduced or delayed for more than 60 days, the producer would have the option to withdraw from the contract without penalty and program crop bases would be restored to their prior level.

We support the payment of interest if CRP payments to participants are more than 30 days past due.

We encourage the annual controlled burning of CRP land under best management practices (BMP). The landowner and tenant should not be penalized for such burns.

We believe existing contract holders should have the option to rebid into the program when their contracts expire. Calculation of CRP rental rates should be re-examined to ensure they mirror the rental rates of comparable land in the immediate area. Rates should be based on the agricultural production value of the land.

Contracts for new and renewal acres enrolled in the program should take into consideration provisions for:

- (1) Highly erodible farmland, including both wind and water erosion;
- (2) An expansion of the continuous signup CRP acreage to include:
 - (a) Filter strips along waterways;
 - (b) Greater widths of waterways, filter strips, field borders and riparian buffers;
 - (c) Setbacks at road intersections;
 - (d) Crop protection product setbacks around tile inlet structures;

- (e) Up to one acre filter strips around standpipes and other intakes where surface water enters directly into subsurface water;
 - (f) Grassed terraces;
 - (g) Buffers around villages, timbered areas, irrigation reservoirs, ponds and stormwater retention basins;
 - (h) Expanding the statewide allocations on field borders and upland restoration projects; and
 - (i) Allowing enrollment of and acceptance of "infeasible to farm" acres (an area that is too small or isolated to be economically farmed).
- (3) Land retired to enhance air quality;
 - (4) Full point credit in the Environmental Benefits Index under new CRP seeding criteria for current grass stands meeting 75 percent of CRP requirements; and
 - (5) Basing the judging criteria for CRP re-enrollment on the land's erosion potential as cropland and not on its current erosion status as CRP.

Other program parameters should include:

- (1) The current rule limiting CRP acres to 25 percent of the total county crop acres including CREP and all experimental pilot projects except for small acreage enrolled in continuous CRP. Any waivers in effect when expiring contracts were enrolled should remain in effect, as determined by the appropriate state Farm Service Agency committee;
- (2) Producers being allowed to maintain their crop base history on CRP acres as long as the producer has met all contract obligations;
- (3) Tree planting programs for such land;
- (4) Farm land that was enrolled in the old CRP program, planted with approved grasses, should not be required to be plowed and reseeded. Established grasses should qualify on highly erodible land accepted in the new CRP sign-up; and
- (5) Existing grass waterways and buffer strips on land with a three-year crop history should be eligible for continuous CRP sign-up. However, acres enrolled in the continuous CRP should not count against county acreage caps.

We recommend that the current CRP rule on length of the rental agreement with farmers continue and that at the end of the 10-year contract the farmer is given the option of bringing the land back into production or bidding it back into the reserve.

Cost-share options should be approved to accelerate conservation structure installation in the year prior to CRP contract expiration.

Provisions should allow an additional five to 10-year extension.

CRP contracts should be allowed to remain as written. There should be no additional restrictions put on the use of the land when it comes out of the long-range CRP.

We support compensation for land removed from production to provide water quality protection. Such land should be eligible for CRP. Producers receiving CRP payments should not be allowed to produce nontraditional crops (biomass) on CRP acres because it provides CRP contract holders an economic advantage over other producers.

We are opposed to haying and grazing on CRP acres during the principal growing months. A fee commensurate to the value of the forage should be charged if grazing occurs after the principal growing months.

Haying and grazing of CRP acres should be permitted at the discretion of the secretary of agriculture in weather-related or other emergency situations or as a maintenance management tool in a timely manner.

We oppose the use of government programs that provide financial incentives for grazing on expiring CRP acres.

We support that the basic businesses of licensed hunting preserves be allowed to continue to operate on CRP ground.

At the end of three years of the second 10-year CRP forestry program, the secretary of agriculture should allow producers to thin the trees at their discretion without forgoing CRP payments.

CREP

We support:

- (1) Eligibility for enrollment for all agricultural commodities;
- (2) Ensuring CREP practices not jeopardize maintenance, operation and utilization of drainage and flood control systems or facilities;
- (3) Ensuring CREP practices not jeopardize the economic viability of the operation;
- (4) The continuation of CREP; and
- (5) Allowing production on acres enrolled in CREP where the purpose is irrigation retirement.

Environmental Management Systems²²⁷

We support farmers and ranchers in their efforts to voluntarily develop private resource management plans to manage their agricultural resources while meeting their production, economic and environmental objectives.

State administration of federal environmental programs should be encouraged on a state-by-state basis where feasible. Federal cost-share funds should be available.

Resource planning on farms and ranches should not be codified into federal law unless it is totally and unquestionably proven to be voluntary, confidential, based on performance standards, and provides acceptable immunity for producers who have exercised good faith compliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

Codification of resource management plans at the state level should be left up to the individual states.

We oppose attempts by state or federal agencies to develop non-voluntary environmental management systems as a regulatory or permitting framework.

When a confidentiality-assured environmental management system is voluntarily developed in any state, administration of that plan should be under the state agency or department most directly involved with agriculture.

All information resulting from an environmental management system should be confidential and the property of the individual farmer or rancher. No portion of it should be stored in any government file or database.

We should work to ensure that the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and/or any other government agency shall advise farmers and ranchers as to the scope of any confidentiality and immunity, or lack thereof, regarding participation in any environmental management system.

Environmental management systems should be designed to provide positive incentives for producers to manage natural resources in such a way that it will benefit the environment and be economically feasible. The incentives should include education, technical assistance, cost-sharing and acceptable immunity.

Any changes to environmental management systems must be initiated only at the option of the farmer or rancher. No immunity should be withdrawn or changed without the consent of the owner of the plan.

To the extent that NRCS is involved in resource management planning, the following criteria should guide its actions:

NRCS should continue to provide traditional technical and educational resource planning programs for farmers and ranchers if no further action is taken on new forms of

environmental management systems. NRCS has played an important role for many farmers and ranchers in better managing natural resources and that effort should not be lost as program changes are debated.

National Conservation and Environmental Policy 228

We believe that improving the environment by enhancing conservation, wise use and productivity of our natural resources through private ownership, individual freedom and market-oriented approaches is our most important conservation and environmental goal. Achieving a zero-tolerance for all pollution is not only improbable, but technically impossible as a result of advances in detection and analytical methods.

We oppose federal pre-emption of state water laws.

A reasonable relationship should exist between economic and social costs and benefits. Public awareness of the costs, as well as the benefits, is a necessary condition of achieving the nation's conservation and environmental goals.

We support compensation at fair market value for environmental or regulatory costs that contribute to the public good.

Conservation programs should be targeted to productive, working farmland. We oppose the use of federal conservation funds for conservation practices on land that is in the process of being developed for non-agricultural use.

We oppose any actions that limit tillage methods.

Direct payments and conservation plans should remain separate.

A consistent long-term national conservation and environmental policy should be pursued that would:

(1) Recognize the importance of improving agricultural productivity, while maintaining a productive natural resource base;

(2) Ensure individual freedoms including the right to own and use private property;

(3) Balance economic and social costs with real environmental benefits;

(4) Encourage voluntary, local and incentive-based approaches in which outcomes are well-defined, identifiable, verifiable and realistic;

(5) Rely on market solutions and/or performance-based approaches in which outcomes are well-defined, identifiable, verifiable and realistic;

(6) Base decisions on sound, scientific principles and peer-reviewed science;

(7) Recognize that education and technical assistance are key components needed to achieve conservation and environmental goals and objectives;

(8) Recognize farmers and ranchers as stewards to the land and protectors of the environment; and

(9) Minimize potential loss of acres from fencing restrictions adjoining waterways, creeks, ponds and lakes.

National conservation and environmental policy should seek to achieve real environmental benefits while minimizing government intervention in agricultural production and private resource management. Watershed and stream management fees by the Fish and Wildlife Service should not infringe on a producer's ability to build ponds, till soils or obtain technical assistance. Good faith efforts and adherence to generally accepted farming practices or Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) approved conservation practices should provide immunity from civil and criminal prosecution under environmental statutes.

Conservation and Environmental Program Implementation

Conservation programs should be implemented in a manner that achieves adequate program participation while minimizing the undue loss of productive farmland that may artificially inflate local farmland and/or rental values.

Federal conservation programs should appropriate more money to build structures such as poultry litter stack houses and composting facilities. The eligibility requirements for this program should be revised to allow more producers to qualify for the program.

NRCS conservation and environmental programs should:

- (1) Be controlled and directed locally by farmer committees elected by farmers, and made available to all agricultural producers. The existing prohibition against funding or reimbursement of existing conservation structures should be removed. Funding should be equally available for repair and replacement of existing conservation structures;
- (2) Provide that 80 percent of all USDA conservation funds be targeted for local county use;
- (3) Be voluntary, flexible, site-specific and targeted at specific environmental goals and objectives;
- (4) Require that all information obtained by government agencies on specific individuals or farms be kept confidential and not made available for public information;
- (5) Require only the minimal amount of planning necessary to ensure success taking into account agronomic and economic factors as well as environmental considerations;
- (6) Provide cost share, tax credits or be based on other positive economic incentives; or provide compensation when an individual's use of property is restricted for the benefit of the public; and
- (7) Promote broad awareness through demonstration projects, information dissemination, education and technical assistance.

We support:

- (1) Funding for the Environmental Quality Incentive Program (EQIP). Funds should be prioritized and distributed on the local level. The primary emphasis should be water quality, soil conservation, on-farm alternative energy systems and animal feeding operation requirements with secondary consideration given to innovative practices and wildlife;
- (2) The use of long-term agreements to maximize the effectiveness of program benefits for existing programs;
- (3) Additional USDA funding for Soil and Water Conservation Districts to help implement conservation practices;
- (4) Funding for cost-share programs, including: consultant fees, the Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative, technical assistance, soil mapping and publication of soil survey information. Once a cost-sharing practice is completed and approved by the Farm Service Agency, payments should be made to the participant within 30 days;
- (5) Funding to ensure that landowners are adequately compensated whenever property is used for purposes intended to achieve mandated natural resource goals;
- (6) Conservation priority areas shall only be established after consultation with local conservation district boards and producers. Federal funding for cost-share under the EQIP should be available for short-term conservation projects previously funded under the agricultural conservation program and be expanded to include cost sharing for on-farm dam building and other projects for water conservation to be used for livestock and irrigation;
- (7) A technical certification process for private sector conservation technicians in which certified technicians would be able to develop conservation plans, revise conservation plans, install and certify conservation practices. Farmers should be able to work with

their NRCS district conservationist to develop the conservation plan required by the 2002 farm bill and not be required to hire the service of a technical service provider (TSP). We urge NRCS to streamline the Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan process and TSP certification;

(8) Development of market-based incentives, pollution permit trading as alternatives to government prescriptions;

(9) Preparation of a list identifying existing state and federal environmental regulations/requirements which impact agriculture;

(10) Legislative protection for landowners from liability resulting from malfunctions of terraces, structures or other mandates of government regulations;

(11) Tree planting as a permanent and economical soil conservation practice that protects marginal, fragile or highly erodible land;

(12) Funding and maintaining the Forest Land Enhancement Program;

(13) Funding for the Conservation Security Program (CSP) with greater accessibility to farmers;

(14) Annual open enrollment for the CSP with shortened contracts if funding for the program cannot fully accommodate all applicants;

(15) A farmer being allowed to opt out of CSP requirements without penalty if the contract is not fully funded;

(16) CSP eligibility based on best management practices including IPM;

(17) Enrollment in conservation programs without a requirement to re-seed existing perennial non-noxious cover to meet diversity goals;

(18) Grassland and farmland protection programs;

(19) Funding for rehabilitation and maintenance for flood prevention sites through low interest loans and grants; and

(20) The commercial use of un-manned air systems for natural resource management.

The Farm and Ranchland Protection Program should be developed in such a manner as to assure landowners property rights and their willingness to participate. We are concerned about nonprofit organizations being given authority to determine which farm and ranch land should be targeted for this program. While we recognize that this program will be administered by NRCS, we believe that voluntary local-based programs will be the most effective.

National Dairy Program 229

We support:

(1) A market-oriented national dairy program that includes a national counter-cyclical income assistance component, such as the Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) program, which is consistent with a worldwide fair and open trade policy;

(2) An expanded role for markets and private enterprise in establishing prices for all classes of milk;

(3) Continuation of the dairy price support program at the current level;

(4) Modifications in the Federal Milk Marketing Order that will enhance the price of milk received by producers;

(5) State and regional initiatives or compacts which are consistent with our overall goal of a market-oriented national dairy program, specifically the expansion and reauthorization of the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact and authorization of the Southern States Dairy Compact;

- (6) The passage of legislation and administrative action that treats imports of milk protein concentrates, ultra-filtered milk and caseine equivalent to and consistent with the importation of similar dairy products;
- (7) Implementing the California standards for fluid milk at the national level;
- (8) A national program for dairy product promotion, research and nutrition education and support for the U.S. Dairy Export Council;
- (9) The collection of promotion fees on all U.S. and imported dairy products;
- (10) Any changes needed to facilitate the long-term market development of value-added products;
- (11) Program savings from the elimination of the Commodity Credit Corporation purchase program being applied to export development programs;
- (12) A national dairy plant security program to enhance a producer's ability to recover losses due to the financial failure of milk handlers or cooperatives. All those procuring milk from producers should be included in the program;
- (13) Research to determine a "no-effect" level for any antibiotics and aflatoxins in milk according to Food and Drug Administration (FDA) standards and also recommend uniform testing procedures for antibiotics and aflatoxins that detect levels according to FDA standards;
- (14) Regulations which provide for and require the inspection of all imported dairy products at the port of entry;
- (15) All imitation dairy products being labeled imitation;
- (16) Producers having a priority lien on their milk;
- (17) Labeling a product cheese only when it is produced from natural milk products;
- (18) The placing of milk vending machines in public schools;
- (19) Modifying the Federal Milk Marketing Order system to encourage the production of milk protein concentrates in the United States;
- (20) A price discovery method which utilizes more milk and expands mandatory reporting and auditing of prices and inventories, including penalties for inaccurate reporting; and Improving price discovery through mandatory reporting and auditing of prices and inventories; and
- (21) That a "no" vote on a referendum should not do away with the federal order.

We oppose:

- (1) A mandatory supply management program;
- (2) Creation of a mandatory fund financed by a checkoff on dairy farmers to guarantee milk checks;
- (3) The adoption of the National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments (NCIMS) proposal to grant Grade A status on imported dairy products, unless the cost of all inspections are borne by the importing entity and equitable access to markets in the importing country's market is provided; and
- (4) Discrimination against large producers in the MILC program.

We urge:

- (1) All dairy producers to enroll in the Milk and Dairy Beef Quality Assurance Program and achieve a five-star quality assurance rating;
- (2) All those procuring milk from producers pay more promptly;
- (3) An increased effort by the dairy industry to develop domestic and foreign markets;
- (4) The FDA not change the definition of milk; and
- (5) U.S. Department of Health inspectors should be accompanied by a state or local inspector and should leave a full report and explanation upon completion of the inspection, which includes: deficiencies, items inspected, equipment disassembled for inspection and overall score.

We support a definition of milk protein concentrate and a standard of identity that will define appropriate use of these components as well as provide a means of enforcement. We support and encourage the use of Cooperatives Working Together.

We support the producer/handler exemption being limited in all Federal Milk Marketing orders, as is the case in the Northwest and Arizona marketing orders, to 3 million pounds per month to protect other pool producer members from unfair competition.

National Farm Policy 230

Agriculture is strategically important to the survival of the United States. Our nation's economy, energy, environment and national security are dependent upon the viability of the agricultural industry. Agriculture must be treated as a strategic resource by our nation and reflected as such in local, state and national government policies. We believe agriculture should not suffer disproportionate cuts in federal spending.

We support a consistent, long-term market-oriented farm policy that will:

- (1) Rely less on government and increasingly more on the market;
- (2) Allow farmers to take maximum advantage of market opportunities at home and abroad without government interference;
- (3) Encourage production decisions based on market demand; and
- (4) Develop risk management tools to deal with the inherent fluctuations in revenue and income associated with farming.

U.S. policies affecting agriculture should be designed to:

- (1) Provide sharp focus on and enhance funding for agricultural research and education;
- (2) Reduce regulatory burdens on farmers and ranchers;
- (3) Provide a tax structure that is fair and equitable to present and future generations of farmers;
- (4) Ensure that U.S. consumers have access to a stable, ample, safe and nutritious food supply;
- (5) Continue to improve the environment through expanded incentives to encourage voluntary soil conservation, water and air quality programs, and advanced technological and biotechnological procedures that are based on sound science and are economically feasible;
- (6) Minimize world hunger and nutrition deficiencies;
- (7) Create and sustain a long-term, competitive and profitable agricultural industry;
- (8) Enhance U.S. agriculture's access and competitiveness in the world market;
- (9) Improve the quality of rural life and increase rural economic development;
- (10) Compensate farmers for their positive impact on habitat, wildlife and the environment;
- (11) Recognize the regional and commodity based differences that exist in U.S. production agriculture and provide programs that meet these needs, while recognizing the need to be internationally competitive; and
- (12) Be implemented in a way that minimizes the negative effects on nonprogram crops and livestock production. Statements of support for individual commodity programs and provisions shall adhere to these general principles of farm programs, regulatory, international trade, and tax provisions.

Improving net farm income, enhancing the economic opportunity for farmers, preserving property rights and conserving the environment are our most important goals. Implementation of the Farm Bill

We should undertake a comprehensive effort to assure U.S. producer competitiveness. Competitiveness issues should include biotech seed cost, agricultural research, U.S.

transportation infrastructure, U.S. farm bill structure and funding, exchange rates and other factors relevant to agricultural global competitiveness.

USDA should recognize eligibility for all farm programs regardless of size.

We urge appropriate funding to advance 50 percent of direct program payments as provided in the farm bill.

In implementing the 2008 Farm Bill, we favor:

(1) Using 2007 and 2008 as base years for calculating Average Crop Revenue Election program payments for the 2009 crop year; and

(2) Maintaining the current definition of "actively engaged" farming.

We urge Congress to fully fund the farm bill and oppose any attempt to reopen it.

Future Farm Policy Design

We support extending concepts of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 into the next farm bill. However, if changes are necessary, consideration should be given to the following:

(1) Reduced complexity while allowing producers increased flexibility to plant in response to market demand;

(2) Maintenance of a farm income safety net while encouraging efficiency, including consideration of an energy escalator clause because of the high prices of fuel and fertilizer;

(3) Driven by the needs of production agriculture;

(4) Be compliant with WTO agreements;

(5) Provide a "green box" compliant compensation program for fruit and vegetable growers. We recommend that the specialty crop industry be given consideration in the farm bill with emphasis focused on fundamental research, food safety, nutrition, marketing and promotions, and investment in the competitiveness and sustainability of the U.S. specialty crop industry;

(6) Trade-distorting domestic support (amber box) may be reduced in exchange for an economically proportionate increase in agricultural market access and elimination of export subsidies. Such reduction in U.S. "amber box" supports should be offset by a transfer to fully funded "green and blue box" eligible programs. This could be accomplished through working lands conservation programs, risk management, the Market Access Program, enhanced crop insurance, the concept of a revenue based safety net program, or government programs that increase producer profitability that may include direct payments and/or tax credits; and

(7) Inclusion of a commodity loan program.

We oppose:

(1) New mandatory government supply management programs and acreage reduction programs, excluding Conservation Reserve Program and conservation easements, for marketing loan commodities under the current farm program;

(2) A farmer-owned reserve or any federally controlled grain reserve with the exception of the existing, capped emergency commodity reserve;

(3) Income means testing;

(4) Payment limitations; and

(5) Targeting of benefits being applied to farm program payment eligibility.

General Issues

We support:

(1) Requiring compliance by the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) with all federal rule-making notification procedures;

(2) Providing timely notification to producers of all program requirements;

- (3) Implementation in such a manner as to minimize the disruptions to landlord-tenant relationships. We support efforts to provide the state Farm Service Agency (FSA) Committee authority to determine eligibility requirements for farm program benefits;
- (4) The elimination of any USDA requirement to report the specific cash rental amounts between a landlord and a tenant in an effort to protect a farmer's right to privacy. We do, however, support the requirement to report the type of lease agreement;
- (5) Requiring FSA to constantly review and make public the formula used to set posted county prices (PCPs) to ensure they accurately reflect market conditions at the county level and that the differential between the cash price and PCP does not penalize producers or county elevators. The formula for calculating the terminal price, differential, and the PCP should be public information to allow producers the opportunity to maximize program benefits;
- (6) Providing the secretary of agriculture discretionary authority to provide assistance to producers during times of economic disaster;
- (7) Extending final loan deficiency payment (LDP) dates to coincide with the USDA crop marketing year;
- (8) Allowing a producer to lock in a published LDP rate at any time after a crop is planted with payment being made only after harvest and yield determination;
- (9) Allowing producers the option of an interest-free deferment on LDPs into the next calendar year;
- (10) Allowing farmers to choose the date that they lock in LDP rates while grain is in storage at feed mills;
- (11) Allowing for verification of actual physical measurement if computer measuring of farm acres results in different acreage measurements than has been the historical case. The cost incurred for such measurement should be borne by the party in error;
- (12) Allowing a single sign up that covers all programs for a crop year;
- (13) Changing FSA regulations to not require farms that are owned and operated by the same individual, but not contiguous, be reconstituted into one farm;
- (14) Individuals directly involved in family farming operations not having payment eligibility adversely affected by farm business loans secured by cross collateralization, (same assets pledged for multiple producer loans);
- (15) The establishment of a reasonable time limitation on USDA's ability to alter or reverse an FSA compliance determination so that no producer enrolled in a farm program may be penalized in a subsequent crop year;
- (16) Allowing either a conservation compliance plan or a confined animal feeding operation permit to meet eligibility requirements for farms which require a conservation compliance plan for eligibility for certain USDA farm programs;
- (17) Increased funding sources be developed to assist farmers in complying with livestock regulations;
- (18) Increased and continued funding for the Hard White Wheat Incentive Program;
- (19) The expansion of the FSA grain facility loan program to include all commodity storage;
- (20) Allowing tenants with multiple landlords to treat each farm as a separate entity for compliance with the farm bill;
- (21) Action by a landlord not placing any tenant farm program payments in jeopardy. The tenant should be able to maintain eligibility for all farms;
- (22) Consolidation of the power of attorney form to enable the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), the FSA and the Risk Management Agency to honor one power of attorney form;

(23) Producers being able to use Federal Crop Insurance records for proving yield for base and yield updates;

(24) Defining "specialty crops" as any fruit, vegetable, nut or non-program crop grown for consumption and sales;

(25) Additional policy options that support the specialty crop industry should be handled separately from the debate over compensation for the loss of the prohibition. We support enhanced spending to support the specialty crop industry through the following prioritized funding options:

(a) Per state competitive grant program to enhance grower directed research and extension programs;

(b) Expanded crop insurance;

(c) Dedicated funding for specialty crop growers in working lands programs; and

(d) Expansion of Market Loss Assistance and USDA Commodity Purchases.

(26) The recognition of horticulture, Christmas trees, sod and equine as agriculture enterprises eligible for government assistance through disaster programs, crop insurance and conservation programs; and

(27) USDA requiring mandatory monthly reporting of rice stocks and rice production.

We oppose:

(1) Producers becoming ineligible for participation in any USDA program due to their participation in federal or state water projects;

(2) Compliance status of one farm affecting the ability to receive benefits on another farm;

(3) The extension of the CCC commodity loans beyond the current term;

(4) The system of anonymous reporting of operator violations to the FSA and NRCS; and

(5) The use of conservation programs by entities unrelated to agriculture.

Sustainable Agriculture 231

Agriculture provides society numerous benefits including but not limited to food security, a safe and healthy food supply, environmental benefits and community stability. It is important to remember that agriculture needs the flexibility to alter cropping patterns and practices to meet the demands of operating in an open marketplace where our competition comes from farmers worldwide. When considering sustainable agriculture, there is only one constant and that is agriculture is only sustainable when it is profitable.

Sustainable agriculture should recognize the benefits of accepted management practices that American agriculture currently employs, such as Integrated Pest Management. Sustainable agriculture should be flexible enough to fit America's diverse climates, cropping patterns, land use standards, and regulatory requirements. Regulations should not limit agricultural practices without strong scientific and economic justification. Sustainable agriculture should rely on measurable results and focus on adaptive management for continual improvements rather than a rigid set of practices.

We support scientific research and education that encourages all participants in the agricultural industry to produce, process and distribute safe food, feed, fiber and fuel in a manner that is economically viable and enhances the quality of life for present and future generations.

We support the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP).

WRP should include a buy out clause that would allow producers to remove these areas from the program.

Authority for the federal government to purchase permanent easements under the program should be terminated.

Prior to a landowner putting part or all of a farm in a government wetland program, all adjoining landowners should be made aware of this, especially where surrounding landowners' water flow or natural drainage is affected.

The program should not be used to take entire farms out of production.

TRADE / TREATIES

Agricultural Exports 245

Embargoes/Sanctions

The threat of unilateral sanctions or other restrictions adversely affects markets and is an inappropriate tool in the implementation of foreign policy.

If a unilateral sanction is declared because of an armed conflict, it should apply to all trade.

The U.S. government should lift all trade sanctions on all countries that may purchase U.S. farm commodities. Requirements for specific licenses and the prohibition on third country financing for agricultural commodities should be eliminated.

An embargo should not be declared without the consent of Congress.

Unless an embargo is approved by Congress, agricultural export contracts with delivery scheduled within nine months of the date of sale should be honored.

Producers should be compensated by direct payments for any losses resulting from unilateral sanctions.

We should not limit the use of export credits and programs in response to domestic supply.

Additional Exports

Agricultural exports will be increased by:

- (1) Continuing to seek new markets for commodities and value-added products to enhance farm income and improve the farm economy;
- (2) Continuing to export regardless of domestic supply;
- (3) Reducing trade restrictions;
- (4) Immediate, unrestricted trade and distribution of U.S. approved biotech products;
- (5) Aggressive market development, including barter, and assistance to the former republics of the USSR and to Eastern Europe;
- (6) The use of export licenses only for information purposes and not to limit the amount, timing or destination of exports;
- (7) Providing USDA and U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) with the necessary resources to monitor and aggressively enforce trade agreements and reduce trade barriers; and
- (8) Decreasing the regulation on the movement of U.S. agricultural commodities to Canadian ports for overseas shipment.

Export Programs

We support:

- (1) Commercial trade for cash and normal credit terms without subsidies;

(2) Expanded use of P.L. 480, within World Trade Organization (WTO) consistent parameters and encouragement for Congress to require USDA and AID to utilize all appropriated funds;

(3) The development of export programs for agricultural products by private entities;

(4) A joint venture by all of agriculture to develop WTO-consistent export promotion programs; and

(5) The expansion and development of hay and forage export markets.

Individual shipment violations should not lead to the disruption of all trade.

We support the Market Access Program (MAP), Foreign Market Development (FMD) and Technical Assistance for Specialty Crops (TASC) programs to retain export markets. Congress should adequately fund these programs and USDA should utilize all of the funds appropriated. All agricultural products should be eligible for access to these funds, if WTO legal.

We urge a reciprocal agreement be executed between the U.S. and Canada for the transportation of agricultural and forestry commodities and transshipment to noncontiguous states.

The federal government must enforce current trade agreements more aggressively to protect U.S. farmers from the non-compliant trade practices of other countries.

Agricultural Imports 246

We believe that agricultural imports from non-World Trade Organization (WTO) countries should be subject to the same regulations and restrictions as members of the WTO.

Legislated import quotas are unacceptable solutions to import problems.

We support the prohibition of imported agricultural products that are produced using chemicals and antibiotics banned or not approved for U.S. commercial use.

We oppose any unilateral action by the United States to eliminate import restrictions and subsidies without equivalent commitments by other countries.

We support consideration of the adverse effects of imported agricultural products on domestic prices before increasing individual agricultural import quotas or reducing the tariffs.

We recommend that only domestic agricultural products, when available, be used in government-supported institutions in the United States.

We should take an active role in supporting the interests of individual commodity producers, when consistent with our policy, for import relief when domestic economic conditions warrant such relief. We favor immediate import remedies consistent with our international obligations to deal with potentially disastrous disruptions during a short marketing period for perishable U.S. commodities caused by a sudden influx of imported competitive products.

We support legislation to give producers of raw agricultural commodities legal standing in petitioning for relief from imports of processed agricultural products.

We recommend that the federal government more closely monitor the importing and/or dumping of agricultural products.

Legislation should be enacted which provides financial assistance for costs of research and legal services incurred by farmers or their representatives who show prima facie evidence of injury and/or successfully file trade relief petitions seeking relief from unfair trade practices.

Countervailing duties should be imposed on imports which are subsidized and the U.S. government should not waive such duties until it finds the production or export of the commodity exported to the United States has ceased to be subsidized. We support legislation that would allow countervailing duties to be imposed quickly when such subsidies are proven. Until trade distorting subsidies are reduced or eliminated, we support import tariffs on subsidized agriculture product imports into the U.S. in order that U.S. agriculture products may remain competitive in the marketplace.

We recommend that authority for the inspection of imported agricultural products be transferred from the Department of Homeland Security to USDA/APHIS (Animal Plant Health Inspection Service).

We recommend that all imported agricultural products at point of entry be subject to the same or equivalent inspection, sanitary, quality, labeling and residue standards as domestic products from the United States and Puerto Rico. Any products that do not meet these standards and the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) standards should be refused entry. The point of entry inspections should be in addition to "processing plant," "field" or other required U.S. government inspections in countries of product origin and should be paid for through user fees paid by the importer. We should increase efforts to ensure that imported foods meet standards equivalent to those set for domestic products.

Rejected products should be marked in such a manner that they will not be accepted at other ports. We support increased funds for inspection of imported agricultural products.

We support APHIS in the establishment of minimal risk regions with respect to agricultural import restrictions based on a risk assessment of the potential for introduction of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), foot and mouth disease (FMD) or other foreign animal diseases and the interventions that are in place in the designated region.

Minimum requirements for such designation should include:

- (1) The existence of a national animal identification and tracking program;
- (2) Adequate active testing and monitoring programs for all Office of International Epizootics (OIE) Class A animal diseases;
- (3) Food inspection programs that are deemed equivalent to U.S. programs; and
- (4) Product labeling that will enable tracking of the product.

We support the use of sound science and OIE guidance in classifying countries as a minimal risk region for BSE. Farm Bureau reaffirms its support for using sound science as a basis for reopening our markets to ensure continued consumer confidence. However we are concerned about the process of reopening markets on our domestic beef industry. We urge USDA to use measures and protocol to open the market in order to ensure consumer confidence and enhance our beef industry. We encourage the AFBF Board of Directors to closely monitor the actions of the USDA and others to meet these goals.

We support a ban on the utilization and importation of animals, animal products, animal protein and animal bi-product protein (i.e., meat, bone, blood meal) for any use in the United States from sources known to have BSE, FMD or other infectious and contagious foreign animal diseases that have not been designated as a minimal risk region.

We support taking advantage of new security equipment at ports of entry to detect illegal plant and animal products or diseases.

We recommend an audit of the meat inspection system to ensure regulations are being followed. Rejected lots of meat should be tracked and denatured.

We recommend quality standards and increased testing of imports for pesticides. We support adequate funding to inspect imports.

Live animals shipped to the United States for processing should be reported as an imported product.

We oppose the use of technical customs classification rulings to modify the correct and legal duty on imported products.

Agricultural products that also have an industrial use or application shall remain classified as an agricultural commodity for purposes of trade.

We support the passage of legislation and administrative action to address the importation and reporting of sugar-containing products created for the purpose of circumventing the U.S. sugar import quota.

We urge strict enforcement of anti-dumping provisions of the Omnibus Trade Act of 1988.

We urge the Department of Homeland Security and APHIS, as it develops regulations relative to regionalization as required by WTO, to work cooperatively with industry in developing a program that ensures U.S. producers and consumers they will not be put at undue risk from the introduction of foreign plant and animal diseases.

We oppose importation of livestock from any country without adequate testing, quarantine and tracking due to the possible spread of disease.

We should continue to monitor the Meat Import Act of 1964, as amended, to ensure that it operates in the interest of the U.S. meat industry and producers from Puerto Rico.

We support the development of an orderly marketing framework involving all countries importing lamb into the United States.

We recommend the use of the USDA quality grade stamp to only meat derived from animals born, raised, and processed in the U.S.

We support closing the loophole in the Caribbean Basin Initiative that allows an entity to import ethanol tariff-free into the United States.

Foreign Aid 247

We support federal funding and public/private incentives for food aid, in order to:

- (1) Provide domestic and international humanitarian relief in accordance with international trade rules;
- (2) Improve the marketability and positive public-relations value of U.S. agricultural products;
- (3) Move towards targeted assistance using further-processed or finished food products; and
- (4) Shift away from funding programs that are considered export subsidies.

Emergency food relief needs should have the highest priority in foreign aid programs.

We support continuation of the Food for Peace Program (P.L. 480) and believe the primary emphasis should be given to humanitarian needs.

We recommend that the use of P.L. 480 be expanded particularly in areas of the world that are suffering from immediate drought or plagued with hunger problems.

We support efforts to shift P.L. 480 recipient countries to commercial sales by shortening credit terms and increasing interest rates as certain recipient countries become more affluent.

We favor foreign aid in the form of agricultural products and U.S. value-added agricultural products rather than cash, whenever feasible. When the U.S. provides aid to foreign countries, those countries are to be issued credit which can only be used to buy U.S. goods.

Because P.L. 480 has many objectives, including foreign policy, national security, humanitarian aid, and market development, we believe financing of this program should be shared by all agencies, in addition to USDA, whose interests are benefited.

Concessional sales or grants under this program should be made in such a manner as to encourage economic development within the recipient nations.

Foreign aid should not be used in recipient countries to stimulate production or distribution of farm commodities for export that are in surplus in the United States.

The limiting factor in food aid programs is money, rather than an actual shortage of commodities in world markets. In order to meet emergency needs throughout the world, we favor the establishment of an international fund to be used for the purchase of agricultural commodities to meet humanitarian needs in disasters and other emergencies. Participating nations could be permitted to make part of their contributions in the form of commitments or commodities rather than actual currency deposits. Even the poorest of nations could contribute according to situation and ability. All nations should support such a fund and should share in its control in proportion to their contributions.

Military aid is essential to the maintenance of world peace and is a vital part of total U.S. foreign policy. However, we urge other countries to share their percentage of costs for policing around the world. Aid should be given to encourage private enterprise economic systems.

The federal government should be urged to apply countermeasures against countries which discriminate and/or restrict agricultural products from the United States, particularly those countries that receive U.S. foreign and military aid.

Proposals to conduct American foreign aid programs through United Nations agencies should be rejected.

We believe the United States should use its agricultural production capacity to meet the goal of eliminating world hunger.

We support:

- (1) Securing a commitment from the federal government to provide leadership in combating world hunger;
- (2) Increasing the commitment to P.L. 480 and other concessional sales programs; and
- (3) Maintaining the reputation of the United States as a reliable supplier of food for the hungry of other countries.

Global Environmental Agreements and Treaties 248

We strongly oppose any U.S. participation in any agreement that would:

- (1) Impose new regulation on American farmers through the United Nations;
- (2) Increase costs for fuel, fertilizers and agricultural chemicals; and
- (3) Put U.S. farmers at a disadvantage in international trade because of exemptions for developing nations.

We oppose ratification of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Kyoto Protocol.

We urge the U.S. Senate to not approve any environmental treaty without the use of sound science and to ensure our nation is not placed at a disadvantage or our sovereignty threatened.

We oppose the creation of any global environmental agency with extensive powers to regulate the world's environment.

The United Nations should not be given any authority or regulatory power over the natural resources of the United States.

Treaties not ratified by the United States may impact the ability of U.S. agriculture to trade worldwide. We recommend that all action by the executive branch focus on protecting the rights of U.S. producers and our ability to trade. U.S. involvement should not be viewed as an endorsement of a treaty's purpose or de facto ratification.

We are strong advocates of fair and open world trade.

Aggressive efforts must be made at all levels to open new markets and expand existing markets for U.S. agricultural products.

We support the use of funds not utilized for direct export subsidies to be made available for other World Trade Organization (WTO) allowed or "green box" programs (including market development, research and promotion).

Funding should be at the maximum WTO legal levels.

Our government should insist on strict adherence to bilateral and multilateral trade agreements to which the United States is a party to prevent unfair practices by competing nations and to assure unrestricted access to domestic and world markets. All trade agreements should be continuously monitored and enforced to ensure they result in fair trade.

We support a "Special 301" procedure for agriculture.

Implementation of a timely trade dispute resolution process should take into account the perishability, seasonality and regional production of horticultural products.

Any modifications must be compatible with current farm programs as outlined in the farm bill.

We support provisions in trade agreements that prevent economic damage to import sensitive commodities and circumvention of domestic trade policy and tariff schedules while advancing U.S. agricultural trade and food security interests.

We support policies and actions that enhance and maintain a competitive domestic processing (value-added) industry and infrastructure for U.S. produced agricultural commodities.

Future negotiations shall take into account advantages realized by foreign producers through subsidy or other means with respect to import sensitive products that put U.S. producers at a disadvantage. Any formal negotiation of any nation's accession in the WTO should include a positive outcome for American agriculture.

Protectionist restrictions on imported and exported farm inputs such as machinery, parts, petroleum and fertilizer must be prevented.

Tariffs on fertilizer imports, including the antidumping duties placed on solid urea imports should be eliminated.

We oppose international commodity agreements to allocate markets, control supply and restrict world prices to a narrow price range.

We believe trade agreements should not be tied to social reforms, labor or environmental standards of other countries.

We oppose tariff reductions if it results in creating an oligopoly. We support fair compensation for lost agricultural income as called for in the Trade Compensation and Assistance Act of 1978 and the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 for all existing and future sanctions.

We oppose attempts to disguise protectionist policies as an endorsement of the multi-functional characteristics of agriculture.

Government spending for such pursuits should be reasonable and nontrade-distorting.

We support immediate normalization of trade and travel relations with Cuba.

We encourage the U.S. government to strongly enforce U.S. trademarks and patents, particularly when U.S. government entities consider sharing intellectual property with foreign trading partners.

We support harmonization of domestic food safety and quality standards with our international trading partners based on the guidelines set by the WTO and Codex Alimentarius.

The U.S. government needs to enhance its procedures and responsibilities to protect U.S. interests in North America Free Trade Agreement, WTO and other free trade agreements to increase monitoring and reporting on unfair practices of nations with respect to:

- (1) Dumping commodities;
- (2) Subsidizing transportation and commodities;
- (3) Influence of exchange rates;
- (4) Labeling country of origin and quality of inspection;
- (5) Excessive market fluctuation and/or influence;
- (6) Sanctions and embargoes that affect U.S. agriculture;
- (7) State Trading Enterprises;
- (8) Export subsidies;
- (9) Biotechnology; and
- (10) Foreign government ownership of commodity processing facilities that export to the United States.

We support elimination of the privilege of shippers of new products into the U.S. to post bonds in lieu of cash deposits when paying antidumping and/or countervailing duties.

Recognizing the importance of the timber industry to our national economy, we support full implementation, compliance and monitoring of the 2006 U.S.-Canada Softwood Lumber Agreement.

Trade Negotiations 250

We encourage the U.S. agricultural industry be a high priority in world trade negotiations, so that the nation's food security will be preserved for future generations. We encourage all countries to adhere strictly to World Trade Organization (WTO) rules.

Sensitive Commodities

Our highest trade priority remains that of a successful conclusion to the multilateral Doha Round of the WTO trade negotiations. We believe that agriculture's best opportunity to address critical trade issues is in the multilateral arena.

We oppose singling out any one commodity for separate negotiations by the WTO.

We will not take a final position on any potential trade agreement until the negotiations are completed.

The AFBF Board will analyze, review, debate and vote on each and every free trade agreement (either bilateral or regional). We will only support an agreement if it provides a positive outcome for U.S. agriculture. The effects on all agricultural commodities will be considered.

China should adhere to the rules set by the WTO and be closely monitored to ensure agricultural trade commitments are upheld.

We call for a return to adherence to the Normal Trade Relations (NTR) principle as a step in making WTO a viable organization for handling trade problems. The United States should approve NTR tariff treatment for any country that agrees to reciprocate and conduct itself in accordance with WTO rules. We will support immediate NTR status and GSM-102 credit for the former republics of the Soviet Union and Eastern Bloc countries provided they meet these criteria.

We support the renewal of trade promotion authority for the President of the United States.

Trade Negotiating Objectives

We will urge our administration to support the following objectives for all trade negotiations:

- (1) Elimination of export subsidies;
- (2) Elimination of non-tariff trade barriers;
- (3) Transition other countries to provide decoupled domestic support as the United States has already done under the FAIR Act;
- (4) Discipline and transparency of state trading enterprises;
- (5) Ensure market access for biotechnology products;
- (6) Include all agricultural products and policies in the negotiations;
- (7) Include all ultra-filtered dry dairy products plus casein under WTO quotas for dairy;
- (8) Address issues concerning import sensitive products;
- (9) Elimination of export sanctions and all export restraints;
- (10) Shortening of the WTO dispute settlement process;
- (11) Opposition to reopening of the WTO SPS Agreement;
- (12) Provide special provisions for developing economies if self-determination is eliminated and an objective criteria for determining developing country status is adopted;
- (13) Adopt a formula approach for the negotiations;
- (14) A single undertaking in trade negotiations;
- (15) Opposition to attempts to disguise protectionist policies as an endorsement of the multi-functional characteristics of agriculture;
- (16) Opposition to the Precautionary Principle;
- (17) Opposition to the use of geographic indicators;
- (18) Opposition to special unilateral tariffs for developing nations; and
- (19) Inclusion of a peace clause.

We urge USDA and the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) to work with industry representatives to provide a timely and aggressive response to any infringement of trade agreements.

We encourage USDA and the USTR to work aggressively to end unfair trade practices whenever they are found. We recommend that agriculture trade negotiators aggressively protect agriculture's interest.

We encourage USTR to work with WTO member countries to establish objective criteria to determine which countries qualify as developing countries.

We oppose the Generalized System of Preferences for agricultural products, whereby developing countries are granted duty-free entry on certain products, since this runs counter to the NTR principles.

We encourage better reciprocal agreements between the United States and Canada to protect U.S. producers in collecting monies due in private sales transactions.

We support measures that would better protect producers who ship vegetables to Canada, especially in regard to grades and standards.

All reporting, monitoring and inspection requirements must be fully adhered to by importing countries and strictly enforced by the appropriate agencies.

We recommend that use value tax treatment of agricultural land be classified in any WTO agreement as a permitted, nondisciplined producer support element.

We advocate the development of classification criteria for developed and developing country status in the WTO discussions rather than the current self-election process.

Since the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), we support strict enforcement of import restrictions and enhanced export support from our government, and we support the concepts of equivalent quality inspections for domestic and foreign products.

We are opposed to any effort to rewrite the NAFTA.

NAFTA trade relief should be negotiated to protect regional producers of fresh fruits, vegetables and nursery products.

We support trade treaties negotiated with other countries to encourage equal implementation of patent rights relating to biotechnological agricultural seed products.

We support USDA as the federal agency for food inspection and food safety, having the primary role in the U.S. trade negotiations.

U.S. Border Regulations 251

To prevent the spread of pests and disease, we favor strict enforcement at all ports of entry against smuggling of food, birds, plants and animals into this country.

We encourage a thorough inspection system by USDA and U.S. Customs on all products moved across the Mexican or Canadian border or other ports of entry into the U.S. The federal government should provide adequate and efficient services at all U.S. border crossings to protect the general health and welfare.

We support increased presence and cooperation of all branches of law enforcement on both sides of our borders, to eliminate border theft, drug and human trafficking as well as illegal crossing.

We must secure the borders of the United States by the most technologically advanced means possible and in a way that has minimal impact on agricultural producers. We support the use of a virtual fence on agricultural land where feasible.

We support legislative or administrative action that would eliminate imports of foreign trash.

United Nations 252

The United States should evaluate its participation in the United Nations (UN). We urge a congressional investigation into the need for and effectiveness of our participation in the UN programs. The investigation should serve as the basis for determining our future participation in these programs.

We support:

(1) Reduction in all UN programs establishing international environmental standards, land-use regulations, interpreting environmental laws, rules or regulations of the United States, and interfering in the land-use or development of any U.S. business;

(2) Congressional efforts to reduce the U.S. share of the UN budget;

(3) Any nation not contributing its equitable share to the support of the UN not being permitted to vote;

(4) The UN and its affiliated organizations should be used as tools to encourage the nations of the world to cooperate in the solution of international problems. UN actions should not obligate the United States to participate in specific programs without ratification by the Senate; and

(5) U.S. production agriculture involvement in the UN discussion on sustainable agriculture.

We oppose:

(1) One world government, and any treaty or pact that encourages one world government;

(2) U.S. troops being under UN command;

(3) The stationing, except for training, of foreign UN troops and equipment in this country;

- (4) Any plan to create a UN park;
- (5) UN ownership of any public lands within the United States; and
- (6) Implementing an international tax authority that is being proposed by the UN.