



Volume 37

December 2014

No. 10



HAPPY HOLIDAYS FROM WIFE!

-- Share these ag facts with your family and friends over the holiday season --

- In 1882, Thomas Edison's laboratory assistants introduced the first electrically-lit Christmas tree. It had 80 bulbs and cost a small fortune.
- For every Christmas tree harvested, three seedlings are planted in its place. In the U.S., about one million acres are dedicated to tree farming. Each acre provides enough oxygen for 18 people.
- Every state in the U.S. grows Christmas trees.
- The first recorded reference to the Christmas tree dates back to the 16th Century.
- Since 1917, the Province of Nova Scotia has presented the Prudential Center tree to the people of Boston in gratitude for the relief supplies received from the citizens of Boston after a ship exploded in 1917 following a collision in the Halifax, Nova Scotia Harbor.
- There are close to 15,000 farms growing Christmas trees in the U.S. and over 100,000 people are employed full or part-time by the industry.
- Food consumption at Christmas dinner only ranks third, behind Thanksgiving and Super Bowl Sunday.
- One poll found that 38 percent of people give away their fruitcakes instead of eating them.
- Since the 1970s, the Kennedy Space Center has made their shuttle landing facility available for an emergency landing by Santa Claus, should problems develop during his annual visit to children around the world!

Fun facts courtesy of oklahoma4h.okstate.edu (facts 1-7);
delish.com (facts 8-9) and justreadfamilies.org (fact 10).





By Ruth Laribee
New York

President's Report

Washington leaders need to hear your voice now more than ever before

WIFE members from across the country joined together November 12-15 for our 38th Annual Women Involved in Farm Economics Convention in Phoenix, Arizona, noted for its agriculture. Many states and individuals worked hard with our 2014 convention Chairman Kerry Froese and Co-chairman Pat Torgerson, putting together a very successful and informational agenda.

This year we continued to communicate with our representatives via visits, letters, e-mails and phone calls. We traveled to Washington, D.C., meeting with Congressional leaders, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) representatives and agriculture committees, speaking with facts on how their legislation and regulations will affect our producers. While there, we also spoke with other farm organizations, agencies and consumer groups.

WIFE persisted by writing several letters, e-mails and making phone calls concerning the Clean Water Act, the Beef Check-off, the Country of Origin Labeling (COOL), Renewable Fuels, and other issues to Congress. Comments were sent to the Federal Register on the Clean Water Act and Renewable Fuels. Press releases were sent out on Country of Origin Labeling and the Beef Check-off. We signed on with a few special coalitions making our voices stronger.

Agricultural issues need our constant vigilance, as it is not in our producers' or consumers' best interest to have rules without representation.

One of these issues is Country of Origin Labeling, which has made a continuous long process, trying to have

proper labeling for our consumers. The World Trade Organization (WTO) compliance panel ruled against United States labeling regulations as they reported it gives the domestic meat products an unfair advantage against the meat importers. They did find that the labels equip U.S. consumers with information on the origin of their food items. Mexico and Canada declare that the labels "do not serve their intended purposes."

In 2012, the U.S. amended COOL when the WTO ruled against them making this 2014 ruling, which makes it the second time the WTO has ruled in a like manner.

Please continue to write, e-mail and/or call your representatives. It is very important as we have the right to know where our food and produce come from. One of the consumer groups we met with while in Washington, Food and Water Watch, called the ruling a "threat to consumer's right to know." We agree with that statement.

Another issue that needs your input is the importation of Argentinian beef. Please send your comments on the proposed rule on Argentina imported beef by the agency Animal and Plant Health Inspection (APHIS) to Federal Rulemaking Portal, <http://www.regulations.gov/#!docketDetail;D=APHIS-2014-0032> or write to Docket No. APHIS, 2014 0032, Regulatory Analysis and Development PPD, Station 38-03.8 4700 River Road Unit 116, Riverdale, Maryland, 20737-1238.

The proposed rule issued by APHIS would amend regulations to provide for the importing of beef from the northern part of Argentina into the U.S. It states, "Provided certain conditions are met while continuing to protect the U.S.

against the introduction of food and mouth disease." Foot and mouth disease is highly contagious; our U.S. cattle and dairy producers, as well as our consumers, need to be certain they are protected.

After a meeting held this past October in Australia, negotiators are working out a new trade agreement, which includes eleven other countries and the U.S. in a Trans-Pacific Partnership (TTP) pact. One issue is intellectual properties protection for biotech drugs. It is reported that once the TTP is concluded it could be the "largest free trade deal in history." In Pennsylvania there is deep concern that their economy will be hit hard by the TTP decisions. Pennsylvania is the address used by 1,200 life science firms supporting 42,000 jobs in ground breaking products known as "biologics."

The medications include commanding new treatments for Alzheimer's and Cancer, using different biological material and methods, therefore being subject to different regulations than traditional drugs. It takes twelve years for companies to make a break-even on their high investments.

The negotiating team has not as of yet advocated the data protection law passed by Congress. If not proposed, investors faced with unfair competition and subjective regulations in other TTP countries might not have the resources for future research and development of cutting-edge biopharmaceuticals. If this happens they might look for funding from other countries, therefore leaving the U.S.

December 31 ends my two-year term as National WIFE President. It has been a privilege and honor to serve you. I look forward to working with our newly elected President Linda Newman.

Cereal Grains Report



By Jean Wach
Nebraska

Farmers reach agreement with Monsanto over unapproved GMO wheat

Agriculture Department officials said the modified wheat discovered in the Oregon field is the same strain as a genetically modified wheat that was designed to be herbicide-resistant and was tested by seed giant Monsanto a decade ago but never approved.

Rather than paying the costs of protracted litigation, this agreement puts that money to work in research and development efforts for the wheat industry. It does this while providing a negotiated level of compensation for farmers with documented soft white wheat sales from May 30 to November 30, 2013.

Resolution in this manner is reasonable and in the best interest of all of the parties. The company will put roughly \$2.1 million into a settlement fund to pay farmers in Washington, Oregon and Idaho who sold soft white wheat during the time frame of the unapproved GMO

discovery.

Monsanto will also pay a total of \$250,000 to four wheat grower's associations, including the National Wheat Foundation, the Washington Association of Wheat Growers, the Oregon Wheat Growers League and the Idaho Grain Producers Association.

Representatives for the growers groups could not be reached immediately for comment. With this agreement Monsanto admits no liability. If there is any money in the settlement fund left over after all the claims have been paid, that money will go to these four wheat industry associations.

In September, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) said that it believes the genetically modified wheat in Oregon was the result of an isolated incident and that there is no evidence of that wheat in commerce. The report said the government still does not know how the modified seeds got into the fields.

Freezing temperatures in the Midwest have raised fears of winterkill in the winter wheat crop. Wheat advanced to trade near an 11-week high as investors weighed the outlook for the Australian harvest, which began last month, and showed concerns that freezing temperatures in parts of the U.S. may damage crops.

Western Australia's wheat crop, the country's biggest, may be 1.9 percent less than estimated in October after storms hit last month. Last week, Grain Corp Ltd., eastern Australia's largest grain handler, said that it expects a below-average harvest.

In the U.S., continuing cold temperatures will push wheat further into dormancy in most areas of the Midwest and stall any remaining planting to be done. McCook Gazette, Agweb.com

Monsanto and the attorneys for Soft White Winter wheat farmers in the Pacific Northwest announced that they have reached a settlement in lawsuits, which charged that farmers were financially damaged when exports of U.S. wheat were temporarily halted in 2013 due to genetically modified (GMO) wheat being found in the area.

Genetically engineered wheat has not been approved for U.S. farming but it was found in Oregon in 2013. That discovery prompted Japan and South Korea to temporarily suspend some wheat orders, and the European Union called for more rigorous testing of U.S. shipments.

WIFE 2014 Commodity & Topic Chairs

Beef

Whitney Klasna

Cereal Grains

Jean Wach

Dairy

Kay Zeosky

Energy

Barbara Broberg

Homeland Security

Marlene Kouba

Media

Diane McDonald

Natural Resources/Private Property/Water/Endangered Species

Alice Parker

Rural Life/Farm Finance Communication/Tax/Health

Donna Bolz

Sheep & Goats

Tammy Basel

Sugar

Klodette Stroh

Trade

Pam Pothoff

Transportation

Pat Torgerson

Beef Report



By Whitney Klasna
Montana

Canada, Mexico reap benefits since implementation of COOL

A very disappointing decision from the World Trade Organization (WTO) recently ruled that the United States Country of Origin Labeling (COOL) regulations are in some respects inconsistent with U.S. trade obligations. The ruling results from a challenge to COOL filed by Canada and Mexico at the WTO in 2008. The WTO has never said we cannot require country of origin labeling on products; the WTO has only explained that COOL has to be implemented in a way that conveys sufficient origin information to the consumer.

What's interesting in the COOL debate is that some retailers in Canada have their

own designated domestic beef labels and others partner with Canada Beef Inc. and use a trademarked stylized maple-leaf label through a licensing agreement. Canadian Beef Inc. is the country's national checkoff group, comparable to the Cattlemen's Beef Board in the U.S. Canada goes beyond what is allowed under the U.S. beef checkoff by advocating more for Canadian beef products. On its website, Canada Beef Inc. touts retailers labeling Canadian country of origin for their retail beef products.

What's also interesting is that cattle imports have increased from the complaining countries (Canada and Mexico) since COOL was implemented in 2009. Since reopening, live Canadian imports in 2005 following the bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) ban, imports of live Canadian cattle have ranged from 512,000 head in

2005 to a high of 1.58 million head in 2008. COOL went into effect in 2009, the same time the U.S. went into recession. Canadian cattle imports fell to as low as 686,000 in 2011, but rose back to just over one million head in 2013, according to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)'s Economic Research Service. From the South, the U.S. imported 974,700 feeder cattle in 2013 from Mexico, down from 1.44 million in 2012 and 1.38 million in 2011. So far this year, cattle imports are 88,000 head higher year-to-date than 2013.

COOL supporters are urging the U.S. Trade Representative to consider appealing the WTO ruling. They are also asking the USDA to review the ruling to determine whether additional regulatory changes may permit the U.S. to come into compliance without weakening COOL.

Water Pollution and Solution by Bobbie Massey

In her position, Natalie Brassill, Assistant in Extension, Water Quality for the University of Arizona Maricopa Ag Center, conducts lab and field research in water quality. She then uses that information to teach and train in three primary areas: 1) surface water quality (rivers, lakes and streams); 2) food safety (irrigation water and pathogen transfer; and 3) water reuse (direct potable reuse, indirect potable reuse and irrigation reuse.)

The obvious water quality issues include oil, calcium buildup, acid mine drainage, standing water, and detergent runoff. The first step is to determine where the contamination comes from, i.e. waste water, recreation, wildlife, etc. Point sources include pipes, ditches, ships, and factories. Non-point sources occur when direct sources cannot be identified. Some of the pollutants might be nutrients for fertilizers and pesticides; organic waste from manure and sewage; pathogens such as bacteria and viruses; salt from irrigation and acid mine drainage; sediment from erosion; and toxins.

Water quality cannot be determined as "good or bad" but should be applied to the USE. There are different standards for each different use. For example, the standards allow 235 E. coli/per 120 milliliters for recreational or irrigational use, but "0" in drinking water. Standards are updated for domestic, recreational, aquatic life and agricultural uses every three years by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). It is also important to note that water quality can change rather rapidly.

Microorganisms in the environment include bacteria such as E. coli and salmonella, viruses such as rotavirus, and parasites such as giardia. Testing for most pathogens is expensive, takes a long time, requires a large volume of water, are difficult to identify, and can only be tested for one at a time. Therefore, it is common to test for E. coli because it is easy to collect, is an indication of fecal content, suggests the presence of other pathogens, and is relatively safe to handle. Most strains are harmless, but some may cause illness.

In addition to field-testing, Natalie and her colleagues take part in an outreach program that includes training volunteers in field sampling and educating students through the Science Education Mobile Lab Unit. They supply support, training and curriculum to the food safety industry. They conduct risk-based studies in contamination simulations, storm water quality monitoring and baseline monitoring. In addition they work on research in water reuse, conduct experiments to improve methods of detection and supply feedback to various industries.

The final message Natalie passed on to her listeners was to COOK OUR FOOD!



By Barbara Broberg
Montana

Energy Report

Control systems continue to revolutionalize all industries

There was a problem with a monitor on a rural water district. The fix was expected to take a lot of digging and time but a water technician from another state was able to identify a fix: a telemetry unit. A farmer on the water system installed the unit and the cost of the unit was less than \$150. The farmer telling the story was still grinning on this unexpected development—an improvement with less cost and effort and with information continuing to come from the unit (the unit “talks” to the person needing the information).

Control systems are revolutionizing all industries. It is the reason electricity is becoming “smart.” WIFeline energy has mentioned the collection of information about how electricity travels, where it is lost and where the moving of it can be made more efficient. When electricity doesn’t move as intended (a downed line for instance), control systems can step in to make split second decisions on what to do as they help with safety. Read at www.controlglobal.com if this kind of thing interests you.

The new oil refineries being built have continual monitoring capabilities to adjust for variances in product arriving. The calculations on how to process are made immediately so efficiency in production happens because it is immediately apparent what the physical attributes of the product are. If there are disruptions in the refinery, control systems can work quickly with the new scenario.

After a big event like an oil spill or an unexpected explosion, there is extensive study. Often this is the platform to gain control systems, which makes it easier for something major to be handled sooner and with greater intelligence. Computing communications are needed. There is way too much going on in processing facilities to look on a computer screen and decide

what to do.

In the regulatory end of the world, control systems show the regulating agency, or the production manager, what the qualities or the flaws are in a business. Corrections can be implemented sooner if the problem is identified in real time, rather than later. For instance, in a bread bakery, corrections could be made before the product is baked. The amount of heat emitted, elements that make bread smell so fantastic and other outputs are moni-

tored as they are exiting the facility. This could all seem excessive from a regulatory standpoint but it allows the production people, and their control systems, to see where their heat or moisture concerns could be modified. Proving safety is necessary in today’s world.

When everyone can see the same page, it is helpful when looking and analyzing something. An example is looking at the “original” blueprints while seeking certain strength points in a building to be [possibly] renovated; all parties involved can study the blueprint plans on their various smart phone or tablet computer devices while observing the bricks and cement in person, together.

There is a happy era of equipment coming on; one farm implement dealer said they now only order equipment with a reversing fan. Every 20 minutes the equipment is powered—if you think of a grain combine, there is a puff of dust. the radiator fan is blown clean by reversing rotation, and then it reverses back. The cleaned radiator keeps equipment from overheating. Another example of this is a computer reversing, slowing, or speeding the fan for a more perfect engine performance.

New farm equipment tends to have a plastic holder for the equipment manual inside the actual machine. In the olden days it would take unearthing the forefathers to locate the unused or well used equipment manuals. There is a repository in Helena, Montana at the State Library for these helpful equipment instructions and maintenance specifications.

A windmill farm in Montana is controlled from somewhere in California and the windmills are communicating even while being controlled. A computer is no substitute for a farmer; a farmer can substitute for a computer. A farmer with a computer, possibly even control systems, and a good work ethic, will continue to innovate and adapt, as usual.

WIFE Supporting Members

VIP Membership

- Bayer CropScience

Executive Membership

- Renewable Fuels Association

Associate Membership

- American Bankers Association
- American Council of Life Insurers
- Monsanto
- Florida, Texas, and Hawaii Sugarcane Growers
- U.S. Beet Sugar Association

Contributor Membership

- American Sugarbeet Grower’s Association
- North Bridge Communications
- Western Skies Strategies
- AT&T

In-Kind Contributors

- Miller/Coors
- Rauner & Associates

Attorney Harriet Hageman addresses WIFE members about the Clean Water Act and how landowners may be affected

Written and presented on the radio by Trade Chairman Pam Potthoff,
Submitted by Alice Parker, National Natural Resource Chairman

WIFE just completed their national convention in Phoenix, AZ. One of the highlights of the convention was a presentation by Harriet Hageman, attorney at law from Wyoming, concerning the case *United States v. Hamilton*.

As most of you know, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) at the present time is trying to expand the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act (CWA) to include all waters of the U.S. and not just those that are navigable. The original Clean Water Act was written with an exemption for normal farming and ranching activities, soil and water conservation, and construction and maintenance of an irrigation ditch. It also allowed the Secretary of the EPA to issue permits for the discharge of dredge or fill materials into the navigable waters of the United States. Over the last 20 years the EPA has tried to dramatically alter what can happen under the Clean Water Act.

Hageman pointed out that water is under the jurisdiction of the states—it is the state's right to regulate and control the use of water and land. Hageman stressed the best and most responsible government is at the local level. However, since 2006, the EPA has interpreted the CWA to say that the entire U.S. falls into some type of water area that can be under the jurisdiction of the CWA. The new proposed definition of waters of the United States, included in an 86-page document, would make all the exemptions (including the agricultural ones) go away.

The comment period for these new regulations ended last Friday. We know that thousands of comments AGAINST the new regulations have been filed. EPA Director Gina McCarthy has held meetings across the nation to persuade citizens that the EPA does not intend to expand its jurisdiction. WIFE feels, even if they don't intend to expand now, changing the regulations opens the potential for an expansion of jurisdiction in the future and we oppose this move.

Even now, the EPA has claimed authority and uses the permit process to assess huge fines to individuals' landowners. The CWA has no statute of limitations for liability, although there is a five-year statute of limitations for penalties. Those penalties for not getting a permit run from \$25,000 to \$37,500 per day.

In the case of *United States versus Hamilton*, the case carried on for over five years and the fines against Hamilton were \$65 million.

In most of the cases brought by or against the EPA, the agency has such enormous power that there is no economical way to fight back. The entire time a lawsuit is going on, fines and fees continue to mount. The fines become due the day the work is finished, even if charges are not filed until years later.

This same thing could happen to anyone under the Clean Water Act jurisdiction. Hamilton purchased a dry gulch called Slick Creek. Two irrigation districts, for return flow of water, used Hamilton's creek. These waters had created erosion problems and Hamilton attempted to try to stop the erosion and eradicate the Russian Olives along the edges of the gulch. In the case of *Hamilton*, some anonymous person reported the work.

He paid out a million dollars to fight the EPA. Hamilton won in a jury trial and the U.S. did not appeal the verdict. The jury found that the water in Wyoming is owned by the State of Wyoming. They found that water quantity, regulation, etc., is within the jurisdiction of the Wyoming State Engineer's Office, and that activities on Slick Creek were for the purpose of construction or maintenance of irrigation ditches.

This has great applications for all states. Each state needs to demand that they have the right to exercise its authority to regulate and control the use of water and land. We also need to remind our state government they are not arms of the federal government and should not be acting as such.

If this should happen to you, Hageman says to get the state involved, use a jury, and ask to have your side go first. We need to remind the state that water is under their jurisdiction, not federal jurisdiction.

2014

WIFE Officers

President

Ruth Larabee
7639 East Road
Lowville, NY 13367
(315) 376-2644 EST
grlarabee@hotmail.com

Vice President

Linda Newman
24728 DY Trail
Winifred, MT 59489
(406) 462-5583 MST
dlnewman@3riversdbs.net

Secretary

Darcy Dressler
PO Box 116
Taylor, ND 58656
(701) 590-3579 CST
darcy_dressler@yahoo.com

Treasurer

Shana Baisch
323 Road 300
Glendive, MT 59330
(406) 365-4133 MST
jsbaisch@midrivers.com

Rural Life Report



By Donna Bolz
Nebraska

U.S. McDonald's can learn a few things from the Irish

This is my last Rural Life article. I will no longer be writing Rural Life articles as my term has expired and I have moved on to another area. I have enjoyed writing articles for the Rural Life topic and I hope you have enjoyed reading them.

Gallup, the polling and survey organization, recently reported on the nation's uninsured rate since enrollment in the Affordable Care Act (ACA) marketplaces began. The overall uninsured rate in the second quarter of 2014 (after the initial open enrollment period of the ACA) fell to a new low. It was the lowest quarterly average recorded since Gallup began tracking the percentage of uninsured Americans in 2008.

In the third quarter of 2013, just before the health insurance marketplaces opened, the national uninsured rate was the highest ever. Uninsured rates dropped sharply in almost every state from 2013 to midyear 2014.

State uninsured rates failed to decline in only five states. Those states are Iowa,

Kansas, and Virginia, and remained unchanged in Massachusetts and Utah from 2013 to midyear 2014.

Arkansas and Kentucky, two states aggressively expanding their Medicaid programs in rural areas, reported the most significant decreases in their uninsured rates.

A very interesting fact is that state uninsured rates decreased substantially more in states that fully embraced the ACA. Those states that undertook both the ACA's expansion of Medicaid and state-based marketplaces (21 states) had uninsured rate decreases nearly twice as large as the 29 states that had one or neither ACA initiative.

These results show that the ACA is a success in providing health insurance, decreasing the uninsured rates nationally and particularly in states that have embraced it.

Troubling is the long-term implication of a two-tiered health insurance system—one set of states aggressively embracing ACA methods to reduce the uninsured and witnessing the results, and another set of states choosing not to do so and seeing their uninsured rates falling less or increasing. It will be interesting to see what the numbers look like in five years.

On a personal note, I recently traveled to Ireland. While I was there I attended a

cattle sale at the local sale barn or "Cattle Mart" as they call it. I went in with my friend to watch the sale and couldn't figure out why I got so many strange looks. After sitting there for a while I noticed I was the only woman there with about 100 men.

When we were leaving I did get a chance to visit with a lady who was selling newspapers, magazines and candy. She told me women do not play an important part in agriculture in Ireland. Most have off-farm jobs and few help with the actual farm work.

While I was at the auction, the only ladies I saw was the lady selling items and three women working in the small café.

I am not sure how the prices compare to the those in the U.S. because everything is done using the metric system.

When we stopped at a local McDonald's, I was surprised when I saw the picture of a young farmer on the tray liner. The message on the liner stated that they only used 100 percent Irish grown beef, they knew where their beef came from, they only add a pinch of salt and pepper to their patties and that they were 100 percent beef. Just think how great it would be if you could go to your local McDonald's and see a tray liner promoting beef from the USA. Happy Holidays!

Convention speaker sees problems in Yellowstone wolf reintroduction by Donna Bolz

The wolf is a symptom, not a problem. This was the opening thought of the presentation given by Gary Cole from the Wolf Reintroduction Program at the 2014 National WIFE convention. The West has changed; we no longer live in a "hunting-gathering" economy. The younger generation is no longer interested in hunting for food, now they kill for the thrill and the trophies.

Mr. Cole believes that people have lost touch with the land they live on. In 1995, the wolf was declared an endangered species. The Yellowstone area was looking for a natural predator so that same year, Gray wolf packs were reintroduced to Yellowstone National Park and Idaho. The subspecies, which was native to the Yellowstone area prior to eradication, was the Northern Rocky Mountains wolf; however the species that was reintroduced was the Mackenzie Valley wolf. These wolves were considered "experimental, non-essential" populations.

Such classification gave government officials greater leeway in managing wolves to protect livestock, which was considered one of a series of compromises wolf reintroduction proponents made with concerned local ranchers. You cannot reason with a wolf and some felt the wolf would not work because they know no boundaries. The wolf became more successful than any other predator but it soon spread out of the park to other areas, mainly on rivers like the Missouri.

Wolves don't only eat certain prey; they eat whatever they want as long as it is meat. A fear is that the wolf will eat all of the prey and Mr. Cole believes someone needs to speak up. There are a large number of people that are in love with the wolf but there are small groups who want to tell the truth. "We know we have a problem," he stated, "We need to encourage people to take a look at the facts. We need to deal with what is real."

Natural Resources Report



By Alice Parker
Washington

Clean Water Act

The comment period for the Clean Water Act (CWA) ended on November 14, 2014. Comments were submitted up to the deadline including:

Washington State Directors Submit Comments: Directors of Ecology, Agriculture, Transportation, and Fish and Wildlife submitted comments in a joint letter on November 13th. Although they thanked the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for trying to clarify by making new rules, they said they didn't think the rule would change how the state controls water pollution. Ecology already regulates some waters in Washington State.

They also asked that the EPA develop definitions of "floodplains," "riparian areas" and "contributing flow". They commented that they recognize the difficulty in providing clear definitions and standards nationwide as there is diversity in climate, landforms and ecosystems. Because of these diversities, regional definitions and guidelines need to be developed.

NASDA Submits Comments: The National Association of State Departments of Agriculture asked the EPA to withdraw the proposed rule to change the definition of "Waters of the United States". They commented that "the proposed rule is fatally flawed and would result in significant complexity and uncertainty for state regulated community."

NASDA is asking they withdraw the rule and to collaborate with state agencies, agency associations and impacted stakeholders on the appropriated scope of and limits to federal CWA jurisdiction.

As the proposed rule now stands it undermines the state authority over our precious natural resource and is inconsis-

Sage grouse listing would be economic, political disaster

tent with Supreme Court limits on non-navigable waters jurisdiction. Comments went on to say that the rule "will have adverse impacts on farmers and ranchers that feed our globally expanding population."

Endangered Species Act

The Interior Department is scrambling to meet a September 2015 deadline to avert the listing of the greater sage grouse on the Endangered Species List.

Interior Secretary Sally Jewel has given the grouse rescue team of Jim Lyons, Sarah Greenberger and Michael Bean the task to work all angles (political, bureaucratic and legal) to save the grouse. Some Westerners believe it would be a political and economic disaster. It is being perceived to be as devastating as the spotted owl listing.

The spotted owl listing in Washington State and Oregon bankrupted the timber industry. With no timber harvesting allowed, it shut down all saw mills and put a lot of people out of business. The education system was impacted as well, as timber sales of public lands went to the education system.

Since the funding was not there, additional taxes were assessed to cover the loss of revenue. Virgil Moore who directs Idaho's Department of Fish and Wildlife stated, "I'm not sure that we have another single species out there that's covering that much geography that touches private, state and federal lands to the extent this animal does." One of the tasks and the most important is to build trust among landowners who are disillusioned by those who have listed the Gunnison sage grouse as threatened in Colorado and the possibility of listing in the other areas where the sage grouse lives.

Private Property Rights

Southeastern Colorado continues the fight against the Department of De-

fense and the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site. They currently have 230,000 acres and say they need up to 7 million acres to accommodate their needs. This battle has been ongoing for seven to nine years and currently includes 236,000 acres. National WIFE is submitting comments regarding this issue stating, "WIFE supports the protection of private property rights against government takings by any agency, department, organization or non-governmental organization. We understand the need for and support a strong Defense System for our country. A very important chain in that link of defense is our nation's food supply. When the Natural Resources, including land, is taken out of production by using it for other purposes it removes the ability for ranchers and farmers to produce food and fiber which is a very critical component to our National Security. It is as important as warfare-loaded drones, lasers, and other military equipment in keeping our country secure. Without a secure food supply our country will be devastated [sic]."

THANK YOU DOT MCKAY!

Recently, Donna Bolz sent the dues of Dot McKay to our WIFE Treasurer Shana Baisch. Donna went to see Dot as she recently fell and broke her hip. She is home, gets around good and is doing well. When Donna asked her if she wanted to re-up her WIFE membership, she didn't even have to think about it and said "YES!" She believes in the work WIFE does and wants it to continue. She knows she can't be active but feels her money will help make a difference. She also paid her FAED dues and enjoys getting her WIFeline. On January 1st, Dot will be 104 years young.



By Marlene Kouba
North Dakota

Homeland Security Report

Leaders disagree on what to do with illegal immigrants in U.S.

Thousands of illegal immigrant children from Central America are already in 14 states but more are coming to America and the federal government won't say where or how many are being sent as they do not want such information to be made public.

The nation's existing laws, if enforced, would do a great deal to resolve some of the most critical problems. Many citizens, though, feel the need to take immediate action, including stopping buses transporting illegal aliens.

Housing, education, food and clothing will need to be available for all immigrants. Among the illegals are gang members and carriers of contagious diseases, including tuberculosis. The President had the numbers wrong during his recent address, as more than 50,000 unaccompanied children have already come over the U.S. border this year and the forecast is for more next year.

More non-citizens are being released fewer less are being deported—the opposite of what the President said. Nearly all who cross the border say “We are going to get amnesty. Where is my permission to go north to get my medical care and schooling? President Obama said he will take care of us.”

Several members of Congress visited Central America and agreed that we have similar situations here in America with children in poverty, poor conditions, uneducated and having no chances for jobs. Jobs are no more plentiful here than at home for them.

The White House actually announced its real policy on immigration in a memo hours before Obama took to the podium on November 20. That policy is a 17-point plan that includes several new programs without Congressional approval, budget appropriation or spending authorization, and many of which the President either didn't mention or barely referred to in his speech.

Obama has directed the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to create a deferred action program to give illegal immigrants work permits for at least three years and establishes criteria to keep people exempt

from deportation. DHS will have to employ thousands to process those who come forward and register, submit biometric data, pass background checks, pay fees, and show that their child was born before the date of this announcement.

Applicants will have to prove they have been in the country for at least five years and will have to pay taxes which has already led to fraud in Arizona. The memo also said the DHS will “direct all of its enforcement resources at pursuing” people who are “national security threats, serious criminals, and recent border crossers.”

President Obama is establishing a White House Task Force on New Americans, an interagency effort to identify and support state and local efforts at integration. While four million people will be eligible for the work authorization program, there will be no resources for enforcing immigration laws against the other seven million people here illegally. In the past few years, Obama has stated 22 times on video that he does not have the Constitutional authority to enact the reforms he announced that night.

Less than two hours after Barack Obama's immigration announcement, Sheriff Joe Arpaio filed a lawsuit to have the Constitution upheld. The lawsuit named Obama and Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson, Immigration Services Chief Leon Rodriguez and Attorney General Eric Holder as defendants in an action that seeks to avoid “irreversible harm” from Obama's actions because they will “encourage more illegal aliens to enter the country unlawfully [...]”

The complaint, filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, seeks, among other things, a “permanent injunction declaring the amnesty programs to be unlawful.” A failed bill last year said 34,000 green cards would be needed over a 10-year period but now that is the number the president wants available. There are many protests to this program while Guatemala is expanding locations in America to help people from that country.

Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson increased security at federal buildings following the shooting at Canada's Parliament and domestic terror threats, but whether the little-known agency watching the doors is

up to the task has been routinely questioned in recent years. The Federal Protective Service has more than 1,300 employees who are primarily law enforcement agents monitoring about 13,000 contract guards from private companies who run metal detectors and X-ray machines at federal buildings and handle emergency responses. In May, GAO said 38 percent of guards had never received mandatory screener training.

The Department of Homeland Security is hosting a series of secret briefings to address ongoing cyber threats to energy control systems. Hackers have rarely targeted the controls of electric utilities, oil and gas pipelines, chemical manufacturers and other critical industries.

The agency has scheduled meetings at FBI field offices across the country to discuss the Havex malware family and the recently discovered BlackEnergy cyber threat. The government task force first warned about Havex for its interest in the energy sector and electric utilities. BlackEnergy zeroes in on technical, industrial environments from energy to pharmaceuticals. As the cyber terrorists continue to develop, our risk profile continues to change.

In June of 2011, al-Qaida launched a rocket assault on a group of power transmission line sites in Yemen that plunged the nation in darkness for a day. In March 2012, a 17-year old in the Netherlands was arrested for breaching hundreds of servers maintained by a telecommunications company. In April 2013, snipers attacked a substation near San Jose, California, damaging 17 of the 21 high voltage transformers that provide electricity to the Silicon Valley and much of San Francisco. Airlines are subject to surface-to-air missiles and shoulder-fired missiles that threaten take-offs and landings, which happened in Kenya in 2002. What will be next?

Between who or what is coming through our borders, it is also unknown where or how hackers or terrorists will attack or incapacitate facilities that affect our lives—water, power, electricity, communication, etc. If the power goes off and stays off, our nation and the vast majority of its population will be in dire trouble. This means no cell phones, Internet, travel and much more. Think about it! (Newsmax, Houston Chronicle, DHS)



By Klodette Stroh
Wyoming

Sugar Report

Sugar still at 1980 prices while grocery costs are on the rise

Sugar prices in America are as low today as they were in the 1980s, yet the price of groceries that include sugar as one of the ingredients is on the rise. Shoppers are paying more for sweetened foods.

In 1983, consumers paid 35 cents for a Hershey's chocolate bar, keeping in mind there is two cents worth of sugar in a Hershey bar. Today, U.S. shoppers are paying \$1.39 for a Hershey bar and sugar still constitutes just about 2 cents of its value.

Grocers, like food manufacturers, are quick to pass along the cost of rising commodity prices to consumers, yet rarely pass along the savings seen when commodity prices fall. U.S. raw and wholesale prices dropped more than 50 percent from 2010 to 2013 because subsidized Mexican sugar imports created a near-record surplus ratio of 20 percent.

United States sugar producers do not receive a subsidy for producing sugar from this government. It is important to know there are 120 countries which produce sugar and almost all of them have subsidies for their sugar farmers.

The world sugar market is a thinly traded, heavily subsidized dump market that is the world's most volatile commodity market. It is mind-boggling that Brazil spends \$2.5 billion a year in subsidies and controls 50 percent of the global sugar export. By comparison, Saudi Arabia controls just 19 percent of crude oil exports.

The world's biggest exporter countries such as Brazil, Thailand, India, and Mexico account for 70 percent of global exports. Subsidy rates in those countries have been increasing, causing global

subsidies to depress sugar prices.

It is a fact that the Mexican government directly owns one-fifth of the country's sugar production, making it Mexico's biggest producer and exporter. Under NAFTA, Mexico can export unlimited sugar in to the U.S. market.

Bear in mind that the shrinking profit margins have led to the closure of 53 sugar beet and cane facilities since 1985. Every one of these facilities were built by early industrialists who had a dream for America.

United States sugar farmers need a fair price for their crop. Importing more sugar in to America's market will plunge sugar prices and drive our farmers out of business. Please contact your state senators and representatives to advise the Secretary of Agriculture to discourage any sugar imports.

The sugar industry has provided 372,000 direct and indirect jobs in 42 states and contributes \$21.1 billion in positive economic activity in America. Merry Christmas to all!

'Food security as important as economic security,' says FAED Breakfast Speaker

by Mary Ann Unruh

Julie Murphree was the speaker at the Foundation for Agriculture Education and Development (FAED) breakfast during the WIFE convention on Saturday, November 15 in Phoenix, AZ.

Ms. Murphree is the Director of Public Relations and Ag Education for the Arizona Farm Bureau. She was raised on a farm where their family raised cotton, wheat and alfalfa. She identifies with agriculture and has 20 years of experience in supply chain management and wants to promote agriculture. She feels she has come full circle as she is the third generation involved in agriculture.

Murphree addressed various topics including family farms are not one size fits all and farms come in many different sizes. Today, one farmer feeds 155 people, compared to 126 in 1960. Eighty-five percent of our food comes from family farms and 97 percent of farms are family owned. Julie talked about the diversity in farming as the public does not realize the importance of the family business. A farmer wears many hats such as: nutritionist, agronomist, mechanic, meteorologist, financial analyst and veterinarian.

Julie is involved in marketing and public outreach. She stated that Arizona produces beef to feed 4.6 million Americans and 22 million pounds of pecans. Yuma is the winter lettuce capital of the world. Arizona raises 8 million pounds of apples and has 188,000 dairy cows. There are 20,000 farms and one of the largest farms is owned by the Auk-Chin Indians. Twenty-five percent of Indian farmwomen are listed as the primary owner. Murphree said there is a growing demand for organic and farm fresh produce, which sells at a greater price at farmer's markets and through direct marketing. She also mentioned water and irrigation systems such as pivot, drip and sprinkler systems. She stated, "Food Security is as important as economic security."

Incoming illegal immigrants devastate Arizona ranchers by Marlene Kouba

Dan Bell is the president of the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association. He spoke to members of WIFE on November 13 during their convention that was held in Phoenix, Arizona. He spoke about his own experiences with immigrants, border patrol and the government.

Santa Cruz County has the capacity for 850 head of cattle but run 630 head. The ZZ Cattle Corporation and Bear Valley Ranch run Black Brangus and Black Angus cattle on 50,000 acres, where 94 percent is owned by the United States Forest Service, four percent is private land and two percent is state-owned. They have five herds in 38 pastures and use rotational grazing where one cow/calf unit can be sustained for each 50 acres. They get about 12 to 16 inches of rain a year. Some of the endangered species on their land include Mesquite trees, Sonoran Chub, Chiricahua Leopard Frog, Lesser Long-nosed Bat, Mexican Spotted Owl, Sonoran Tiger Salamander, and the Jaguar.

One of the costs illegal immigration has put on Arizona border ranchers include fencing around cities. Immigrants coming in to the U.S. illegally cut fences as they come in, then go out in different places. For Bell, it has been put up 13 times. They have added spring-loaded faucets for access to water to protect their water systems. The border cost per cow is \$15.00 each with added fences, upkeep, etc. Rancher Rob Krentz was checking his fences when he was shot by an illegal immigrant that ran away; Border Patrolman Brian Terry was later shot and other workers have been shot at; his neighbor was found in a shallow grave; a legal Russian immigrant was killed. Mexican authorities need permission from the local drug cartel to get police to investigate anything.

RestoreOurBorder.org is a website that calls for enforcement of existing immigration laws without exception, to beef up judicial and enforcement mechanisms, fund state and federal attorney's offices, add more border patrol field agents and more horse patrol units, and establish permanent Forward Operating Bases (FOB) adjacent to the border with Mexico (one FOB for every 12 miles is suggested). The presence of patrol has deterred immigrants.

The Arizona Department of Homeland Security Operation Stonegarden project makes grants available to fund deputies equipped with all-terrain patrol vehicles and more full-time Border Patrol agents. Large pole-towers have been erected to expand communications. The border fence has many miles of only four wires along the border. "Three years ago better roads were being built to replace trails. You can't control the border if you can't get to it," Bell said. Technology has slowed traffic; cattle guards have replaced gates; first Responders are Border Patrol. They need to replace outdated air support and deploy them on or near the border. They need to establish Citizen's Advisory Boards in every patrol station and work with rancher groups to address security issues in rural areas. Whenever an agent shoots at an illegal alien, a border patrol has to be present. They also need to establish better cell phone areas.



CONGRATULATIONS TO OUR NEWLY ELECTED 2015 OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS!

PRESIDENT- LINDA NEWMAN
VICE PRESIDENT- MARY ELLEN CAMMACK
SECRETARY- PAM POTTHOFF
TREASURER- SHANA BAISCH
AREA 1 DIRECTOR- DIANE McDONALD
AREA 2 DIRECTOR- KERRY FROESE

Looking for the trade report? Unfortunately, you won't find it in this month's issue as Harold Potthoff, our Trade Chairman's husband, was in a farm accident and broke his hip. Trade Chairman Pam wrote a lengthy, detailed trade report for convention but was unable to edit it in time for WIFeline publication. Members who would like to read the convention report can contact Pam at coyotepp@gp-com.net or by phone at (308) 276-2548 for the complete report.

WIFE Updates

Marilyn Spiker and Sheila Massey Memorial Scholarships Available

The Foundation for Agricultural Education and Development (FAED), in cooperation with WIFE, offers the Marilyn Spiker Memorial Scholarship and the Sheila Massey Memorial scholarship each year. The competition for 2015 will offer three (3) one-year scholarships in the amount of \$1000.00 each. For scholarships to be awarded, applicants must meet set guidelines/standards as described below:

- The student may be a woman enrolling in an agricultural related field. Examples are Agronomy, Agricultural Economics, Agricultural Engineering, Veterinary Medicine, Extension Education, or a related field.
- Any woman who will begin her first or second year of college studies.
- Applications will be accepted where state WIFE associations are organized.
- Special consideration will be given to an applicant, who is a member or the daughter, granddaughter, sister, or niece of a member of FAED and/or WIFE, provided her grades and qualifications equal or exceed those of other applicants.
- The application must be sent to the state WIFE organization by March 1, 2015 along with two (2) letters of recommendation.
- A current photo is required.
- For more information, including applications, contact Donna Bolz at donnab6519@windstream.net.



WIFeline
a publication of
WOMEN INVOLVED
IN FARM ECONOMICS
Published monthly except June and November

Mariah Shammel, Editor
2091 Salt Creek Road
Hilger, MT 59451
(406) 462-5639
paisleyprairies@gmail.com

Change Service Requested

Shana Baisch
323 Road 300
Glendive, MT 59330



PRESORTED
STANDARD
US POSTAGE PAID
GLENDAVE MT
59330
PERMIT NO 147