
CARD Briefing Paper 94-BP 5

Implications of the GATT Agreement for Iowa

John R. Kruse

November 1994




**Trade and Agricultural Policy Division
Center for Agricultural and Rural Development
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa USA**

This is the fifth in a series of *CARD Briefing Papers* that analyzes a variety of issues of interest to agriculture. These analyses are based on the latest CARD and FAPRI baselines, and include topics such as the 1993 flood damage, agricultural policies and projections, FAPRI baseline summaries, CRP analysis for Iowa, and a wide range of international policy issues with implications for agriculture.

John R. Kruse is U.S. crops and livestock analyst, FAPRI.

For more information about this series, or for a current list of CARD publications, please contact:


CARD Publications Secretary
Iowa State University
578A Heady Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011-1070
Telephone 515-294-7519; fax 515-294-6336

The Center for Agricultural and Rural Development is a public policy research center founded in 1958 at Iowa State University. CARD operates as a teaching and research unit within the ISU Department of Economics in the College of Agriculture, conducting and disseminating research in four primary areas: trade and agricultural policy, resource and environmental policy, food and nutrition policy, and rural and economic development policy.

This material is based upon work supported by the Cooperative State Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, under Agreement No. 92-34149-7136. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the view of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The contents of this report may be cited with proper credit to the authors and to the Center for Agricultural and Rural Development, Iowa State University.

Desktop production by Rebecca Olson.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE GATT AGREEMENT FOR IOWA

Background

What is the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)? The GATT may be best described as an ongoing process through which trade distortions among countries are defined and targeted for reduction. There have been seven previous GATT agreements over the years. The most recent GATT agreement represents the eighth round of trade negotiations and is often called the *Uruguay Round* in reference to Punta del Este, Uruguay, where the agenda was set in 1986. The Uruguay Round of trade negotiations was the first to focus directly on trade distortions in agriculture. Agricultural trade distortions were chosen primarily because of increasing budgetary constraints for agricultural programs around the world. An agreement from the Uruguay Round was finally reached in December 1993, after seven years of negotiations that involved 117 nations. Even though an agreement was reached, the U.S. Congress still has to approve the agreement for it to become U.S. law. With the agreement slated to take effect on July 1, 1995, the lawmakers will have to move rather quickly to pass implementing legislation if the GATT agreement is to be approved in its present form. It does not appear that GATT implementing legislation will be passed this fall. If GATT is not approved by Congress in the spring of 1995, many of the agreements will have to be renegotiated.

While the Uruguay Round of GATT negotiations did focus on areas other than agriculture, agriculture was very prominent. The four areas of negotiation (called disciplines) were market access, export subsidy reduction, internal support, and sanitary and phytosanitary measures. *Market access* was defined as the quantity of imports from a particular country that are allowed to enter that country with little or no tariff, or

nontariff barriers. Most countries currently have tariff or nontariff barriers of some kind on some or all of their agricultural imports. The goal of negotiating market access was to increase trade by opening markets that were previously inaccessible. To determine market access levels, a base period of 1986 to 1988 was selected, from which changes in market access could be negotiated. Negotiations set starting and ending market access rates. The starting rate of market access, beginning in 1995, was set at 3 percent of a country's domestic consumption over the 1986 to 1988 base period. This rate would increase to 5 percent of participating countries' domestic consumption by 2000 and then level off. For example, the United States must allow 5 percent of its domestic wheat consumption to enter as imports. This does not mean that 5 percent of domestic wheat consumption must enter, but if world prices are such that foreign countries would like to export wheat to the United States without facing tariffs, they may do so, but only up to 5 percent of U.S. consumption.

The next discipline, *export subsidy reduction*, requires countries to reduce both the amount of money spent on subsidies and the quantity of the commodity subsidized. Budget pressures for many countries, especially the European Union (EU) and the United States, are really what made this a key topic of negotiation. Similar to market access, a base period was negotiated from which reductions would be made. In the case of export subsidies, the greater of the 1986 to 1990 average subsidized exports and expenditures or the 1991-1992 average subsidized exports and expenditures was chosen as the base period. Negotiations resulted in two levels of required reductions, one for subsidy expenditures and one for subsidized quantities. Total subsidy

expenditures are to be reduced by 36 percent from the base level by 2000. The quantity of subsidized exports is to be reduced by 21 percent by 2000. For the United States, this means that spending on the Export Enhancement Program (EEP) and the Dairy Export Incentive Program (DEIP) will have to be reduced. However, concerns over the federal budget deficit may reduce expenditures on EEP and DEIP anyway.

The next discipline addressed was *internal support*. Most countries support their agricultural sectors in some manner. Negotiations on this discipline centered on discouraging the practice of increasing internal supports to offset a reduction in trade barriers. From the negotiated base period of 1986 to 1988, a 20 percent reduction in internal supports by 2000 was agreed upon. The United States is already in compliance with this discipline given the reduction in target prices and in payment acreage from flex. Many other countries are also in compliance with this discipline, but the ruling is important because it limits the ability of countries to simply expand their internal support to offset the required reductions in export subsidies and increased market access.

The last discipline, *sanitary and phytosanitary measures*, was designed to synchronize food safety and health regulations across countries by setting uniform standards and establishing scientific monitoring committees that can make binding assessments. In the past, countries had used food safety and health regulations to restrict imports that may or may not have posed health problems. This discipline seeks to insure that scientific fact is used to set standards.

In addition to the standard agreements on the four disciplines, many side agreements were also negotiated. The specifics of the GATT agreement and side agreements listed by

country are found in the CARD GATT Research Paper 94-GATT 22, Uruguay Round Agreement on Agriculture: Summary of Commitments from Selected Country Schedules.

Impacts of GATT on Iowa Agriculture


The Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute (FAPRI) analysis indicates that nearly all U.S. agricultural commodities benefit under GATT, although some commodities experience larger impacts than others. CARD extended the FAPRI analysis to commodities important to Iowa, such as corn, soybeans, and pork and found that all are significant winners under the Uruguay Round Agreement.

Beginning with corn, Iowa producers would realize increases in demand from two sources. The first source is increased exports. Because the European Union (EU) has committed to maintaining corn imports of 98 million bushels and the United States has a comparative advantage in corn production, corn exports from the United States are expected to grow. In addition, under GATT increased incomes around the world are expected to increase livestock production, further raising the demand for U.S. corn. In total, with full implementation of GATT, U.S. corn exports are expected to increase an average of 121 million bushels over the 2000 to 2002 period compared with baseline levels. The second source is greater domestic demand for corn through increased livestock production. With higher incomes around the world, more livestock exports are expected, particularly for pork. In total, U.S. domestic consumption is expected to increase by an average of 49 million bushels compared with baseline levels over the 2000 to 2002 period.


With the stronger demand for corn, prices are expected to increase. However, as

prices increase, the Secretary of Agriculture is expected to reduce the Acreage Reduction Program (ARP) rate from the 7.5 percent figure projected in the baseline. Beginning in 1999, higher corn prices from GATT are expected to motivate the Secretary to reduce the ARP rate by 2.5 percent. Reducing the ARP increases production in 1999 and drops prices back down to baseline levels.

However, the momentum in exports and domestic demand increases prices above the baseline level after 1999. In Iowa, stronger prices and a reduction in the ARP rate translate into a significant increase in corn acres planted. When GATT is fully implemented, corn acreage planted in Iowa is expected to average 295,000 acres (2.5 percent) higher than baseline levels with corn prices averaging \$0.09 per bushel higher over the same period (see Figure 1).




Iowa soybeans are also expected to benefit from GATT, but not as much as corn. Relatively few trade barriers exist for soybeans, so soybean exports are not expected to increase significantly under GATT. However, despite a reduction in EEP subsidies for U.S. soybean oil, increases in income around the world from GATT are expected to offset the reduction in subsidized exports and U.S. soybean oil exports are expected to increase. Soybean prices in Iowa are expected to average 20 cents per bushel higher over the 2000 to 2002 period when GATT is fully




implemented (see Figure 2). With competition from corn, soybean planted acres are expected to remain at baseline levels.

The Iowa pork sector benefits most from the GATT agreement. U.S. producers are expected to fill the gap created by the EU export reductions and increased market access, particularly to non-EU Western Europe, Japan, and Hong Kong. The U.S.



net pork trade position improves by nearly 1 billion pounds, 6 percent of production by 2002, supporting breeding herd increases of almost 7 percent (see Figure 3). Barrow and gilt prices average 2.7 percent higher than baseline levels over the 1995 to 1999 phase-

in period and 1.6 percent higher than baseline levels over the 2000 to 2002 period. Corn and hog cash receipts account for most of the increase in Iowa cash receipts. By 2002, corn receipts are \$184.1 million higher than the baseline and hog cash receipts are \$110.8 million higher. Soybean and cattle cash receipts also benefit from GATT with an \$83.1 million increase in soybean receipts by 2002 and an expected increase of \$92.6 million in cattle cash receipts by 2002. Of course with higher corn and hog production, Iowa farm production expenses are also expected rise. Total production expenses are expected to be \$221.1 million higher by 2002, an increase of 2.0 percent. The bottom line for Iowa net



farm income shows an increase of \$225.5 million by 2002, averaging \$205.2 million higher each year over the 1995 to 2002 period (see Figure 4).

**APPENDIX A. IMPACTS OF THE URUGUAY ROUND GATT AGREEMENT ON IOWA
CORN, OATS, SOYBEANS, AND FARM INCOME**

Table A.1. Impacts of Uruguay Round GATT Agreement on Iowa Corn

| | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 95-99 Avg | 00-02 Avg |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| (Percent) | | | | | | | | | | |
| ARP Rate | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 |
| GATT Scenario | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 5.0 |
| Change | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -2.5 | -2.5 | -2.5 | -2.5 | -0.5 | -2.5 |
| Participation Rate | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 87.2 | 86.7 | 85.4 | 85.0 | 83.7 | 82.6 | 81.7 | 80.0 | 85.6 | 81.4 |
| GATT Scenario | 87.2 | 86.6 | 85.1 | 84.4 | 84.1 | 83.6 | 82.3 | 80.7 | 85.5 | 82.2 |
| Change | 0.0 | -0.1 | -0.3 | -0.5 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.7 | -0.1 | 0.8 |
| (1000 Acres) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Planted Area | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 12787 | 12839 | 12719 | 12651 | 12714 | 12730 | 12652 | 12743 | 12742 | 12708 |
| GATT Scenario | 12787 | 12859 | 12747 | 12675 | 13063 | 12925 | 13023 | 13064 | 12826 | 13004 |
| Change | 0 | 20 | 28 | 24 | 350 | 195 | 371 | 320 | 84 | 295 |
| Percent Change | 0.0 | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 2.7% | 1.5% | 2.9% | 2.5% | 0.7% | 2.3% |
| (Million Bushels) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Production | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 1660 | 1688 | 1695 | 1708 | 1737 | 1761 | 1773 | 1806 | 1698 | 1780 |
| GATT Scenario | 1660 | 1691 | 1698 | 1711 | 1782 | 1786 | 1821 | 1848 | 1708 | 1818 |
| Change | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 44 | 25 | 48 | 42 | 11 | 38 |
| Percent Change | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 2.6% | 1.4% | 2.7% | 2.3% | 0.6% | 2.2% |
| (Dollars Per Bushel) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Farm Price | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 2.15 | 2.20 | 2.11 | 2.18 | 2.20 | 2.19 | 2.30 | 2.34 | 2.17 | 2.28 |
| GATT Scenario | 2.17 | 2.27 | 2.21 | 2.29 | 2.19 | 2.28 | 2.39 | 2.45 | 2.23 | 2.37 |
| Change | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.12 | -0.02 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.06 | 0.09 |
| Percent Change | 1.2% | 3.2% | 4.4% | 5.3% | -0.7% | 4.0% | 3.6% | 4.4% | 2.7% | 4.0% |

Table A.1. Continued.

| | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 95-99 Avg | 00-02 Avg |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| | (Dollars Per Acre) | | | | | | | | | |
| Participation Expected | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Returns | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 193.71 | 190.25 | 190.21 | 186.62 | 186.02 | 184.66 | 183.50 | 184.58 | 189.36 | 184.24 |
| GATT Scenario | 193.71 | 190.86 | 192.23 | 189.52 | 195.15 | 191.40 | 191.47 | 193.30 | 192.29 | 192.06 |
| Change | 0.00 | 0.61 | 2.02 | 2.90 | 9.14 | 6.75 | 7.97 | 8.72 | 2.93 | 7.81 |
| Percent Change | 0.0% | 0.3% | 1.1% | 1.6% | 4.9% | 3.7% | 4.3% | 4.7% | 1.5% | 4.2% |
| Non Participation | | | | | | | | | | |
| Expected Net Returns | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 146.89 | 137.67 | 143.72 | 129.59 | 137.15 | 138.53 | 134.26 | 149.06 | 139.00 | 140.62 |
| GATT Scenario | 146.89 | 141.48 | 153.92 | 143.35 | 154.34 | 136.27 | 147.59 | 161.95 | 148.00 | 148.60 |
| Change | 0.00 | 3.82 | 10.21 | 13.76 | 17.20 | -2.26 | 13.33 | 12.89 | 9.00 | 7.98 |
| Percent Change | 0.0% | 2.8% | 7.1% | 10.6% | 12.5% | -1.6% | 9.9% | 8.6% | 6.5% | 5.7% |

Table A.2. Impacts of Uruguay Round GATT Agreement on Iowa Oats

| | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 95-99 Avg | 00-02 Avg |
|---------------------------|-------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| (Percent) | | | | | | | | | | |
| ARP Rate | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| GATT Scenario | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Change | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Participation Rate | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 22.8 | 18.6 | 16.7 | 14.3 | 11.2 | 9.4 | 9.5 | 7.8 | 16.7 | 8.9 |
| GATT Scenario | 22.8 | 18.5 | 16.9 | 14.6 | 11.6 | 12.0 | 9.6 | 8.4 | 16.9 | 10.0 |
| Change | 0.0 | -0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.1 |
| (1000 Acres) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Harvested Area | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 223 | 188 | 199 | 213 | 232 | 252 | 269 | 286 | 211.0 | 269.3 |
| GATT Scenario | 223 | 188 | 200 | 215 | 255 | 292 | 323 | 351 | 216.1 | 322.2 |
| Change | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 23 | 40 | 54 | 65 | 5 | 53 |
| Percent Change | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.4% | 1.0% | 9.9% | 16.0% | 19.9% | 22.6% | 2.4% | 19.6% |
| (Million Bushels) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Production | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 15 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 19 | 21 | 14.7 | 19.4 |
| GATT Scenario | 15 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 23 | 25 | 15.1 | 23.2 |
| Change | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 4 |
| Percent Change | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.4% | 1.0% | 9.9% | 16.0% | 19.9% | 22.6% | 2.5% | 19.7% |
| (Dollars Per Bushel) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Farm Price | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 1.33 | 1.34 | 1.34 | 1.34 | 1.34 | 1.32 | 1.34 | 1.34 | 1.34 | 1.33 |
| GATT Scenario | 1.32 | 1.36 | 1.37 | 1.38 | 1.34 | 1.33 | 1.36 | 1.38 | 1.35 | 1.36 |
| Change | -0.00 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Percent Change | -0.1% | 1.1% | 2.3% | 2.7% | 0.2% | 0.9% | 1.8% | 2.7% | 1.2% | 1.8% |

Table A.2. Continued.

| | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 95-99 Avg | 00-02 Avg |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| | (Dollars Per Acre) | | | | | | | | | |
| Participation Expected | | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Returns | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 73.25 | 69.00 | 69.56 | 67.00 | 65.46 | 63.92 | 63.75 | 63.38 | 68.85 | 63.69 |
| GATT Scenario | 73.25 | 69.28 | 70.98 | 69.28 | 68.39 | 66.86 | 65.37 | 66.18 | 70.24 | 66.14 |
| Change | 0.00 | 0.28 | 1.43 | 2.28 | 2.93 | 2.94 | 1.62 | 2.80 | 1.38 | 2.45 |
| Percent Change | 0.0% | 0.4% | 2.1% | 3.4% | 4.5% | 4.6% | 2.5% | 4.4% | 2.0% | 3.9% |
| Non Participation | | | | | | | | | | |
| Expected Net Returns | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 34.58 | 27.82 | 27.25 | 25.16 | 23.53 | 20.81 | 17.03 | 15.80 | 27.67 | 17.88 |
| GATT Scenario | 34.58 | 27.74 | 28.27 | 27.35 | 26.17 | 20.97 | 17.94 | 17.64 | 28.82 | 18.85 |
| Change | 0.00 | -0.09 | 1.01 | 2.19 | 2.63 | 0.16 | 0.92 | 1.84 | 1.15 | 0.97 |
| Percent Change | 0.0% | -0.3% | 3.7% | 8.7% | 11.2% | 0.8% | 5.4% | 11.6% | 4.2% | 5.4% |

Table A.3. Impacts of Uruguay Round GATT Agreement on Iowa Soybeans

| | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 95-99 Avg | 00-02 Avg |
|---------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| (1000 Acres) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Planted On Complying Farms | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 6535 | 6512 | 6659 | 6665 | 6620 | 6570 | 6501 | 6389 | 6598 | 6486 |
| GATT Scenario | 6535 | 6503 | 6634 | 6623 | 6654 | 6652 | 6548 | 6446 | 6590 | 6548 |
| Change | 0 | -10 | -25 | -42 | 34 | 82 | 47 | 57 | -9 | 62 |
| Percent Change | 0.0% | -0.1% | -0.4% | -0.6% | 0.5% | 1.2% | 0.7% | 0.9% | -0.1% | 1.0% |
| Planted On Flex | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 629 | 630 | 633 | 661 | 642 | 640 | 664 | 638 | 639 | 648 |
| GATT Scenario | 629 | 624 | 621 | 643 | 624 | 669 | 643 | 629 | 628 | 647 |
| Change | 0 | -7 | -12 | -18 | -19 | 29 | -21 | -9 | -11 | -1 |
| Percent Change | 0.0% | -1.0% | -1.9% | -2.8% | -2.9% | 4.5% | -3.2% | -1.4% | -1.8% | -0.1% |
| Planted On Non-Complying Farms | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 1495 | 1524 | 1476 | 1516 | 1565 | 1624 | 1710 | 1802 | 1515 | 1712 |
| GATT Scenario | 1495 | 1525 | 1484 | 1542 | 1513 | 1572 | 1651 | 1740 | 1512 | 1654 |
| Change | 0 | 1 | 8 | 26 | -51 | -52 | -59 | -62 | -3 | -58 |
| Percent Change | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.5% | 1.7% | -3.3% | -3.2% | -3.5% | -3.4% | -0.2% | -3.4% |
| Total Planted Area | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 8659 | 8666 | 8769 | 8843 | 8826 | 8834 | 8875 | 8830 | 8753 | 8846 |
| GATT Scenario | 8659 | 8651 | 8739 | 8808 | 8790 | 8893 | 8842 | 8815 | 8729 | 8850 |
| Change | 0 | -15 | -29 | -35 | -36 | 59 | -33 | -14 | -23 | 4 |
| Percent Change | 0.0% | -0.2% | -0.3% | -0.4% | -0.4% | 0.7% | -0.4% | -0.2% | -0.3% | 0.0% |
| (Million Bushel) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Production | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 370 | 373 | 381 | 388 | 391 | 395 | 401 | 402 | 381 | 399 |
| GATT Scenario | 370 | 373 | 380 | 387 | 390 | 398 | 399 | 402 | 380 | 400 |
| Change | 0 | -1 | -1 | -2 | -2 | 3 | -1 | -1 | -1 | 0 |
| Percent Change | 0.0% | -0.2% | -0.3% | -0.4% | -0.4% | 0.7% | -0.4% | -0.2% | -0.3% | 0.0% |

Table A.3. Continued.

| | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 95-99 Avg | 00-02 Avg |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| (Dollars Per Bushel) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Farm Price | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 5.60 | 5.78 | 5.69 | 5.68 | 5.69 | 5.82 | 5.92 | 6.08 | 5.69 | 5.94 |
| GATT Scenario | 5.62 | 5.90 | 5.86 | 5.91 | 5.93 | 5.95 | 6.13 | 6.34 | 5.85 | 6.14 |
| Change | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.13 | 0.21 | 0.26 | 0.16 | 0.20 |
| Percent Change | 0.4% | 2.0% | 3.1% | 4.0% | 4.3% | 2.2% | 3.6% | 4.3% | 2.8% | 3.4% |
| (Dollars Per Acre) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Expected Market Net Returns | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 175.82 | 165.30 | 174.28 | 170.51 | 170.84 | 171.63 | 178.31 | 183.61 | 171.35 | 177.85 |
| GATT Scenario | 175.82 | 166.45 | 179.65 | 178.85 | 181.58 | 183.33 | 184.41 | 194.02 | 176.47 | 187.25 |
| Change | 0.00 | 1.15 | 5.37 | 8.34 | 10.74 | 11.70 | 6.10 | 10.42 | 5.12 | 9.41 |
| Percent Change | 0.0% | 0.7% | 3.1% | 4.9% | 6.3% | 6.8% | 3.4% | 5.7% | 3.0% | 5.3% |

Table A.4. Impacts of Uruguay Round GATT Agreement on Iowa Farm Income

| | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 95-99 Avg | 00-02 Avg |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| (Million Dollars) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Crop Receipts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 4835 | 4829 | 4882 | 4917 | 5027 | 5110 | 5274 | 5474 | 4898 | 5286 |
| GATT Scenario | 4855 | 4909 | 5027 | 5109 | 5192 | 5283 | 5503 | 5749 | 5018 | 5512 |
| Change | 20 | 80 | 145 | 192 | 166 | 172 | 229 | 275 | 121 | 226 |
| Percent Change | 0.4% | 1.7% | 3.0% | 3.9% | 3.3% | 3.4% | 4.4% | 5.0% | 2.5% | 4.3% |
| Livestock Receipts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 5342 | 5046 | 5274 | 5542 | 5415 | 5345 | 5571 | 5811 | 5324 | 5576 |
| GATT Scenario | 5428 | 5160 | 5427 | 5732 | 5650 | 5634 | 5834 | 6024 | 5480 | 5831 |
| Change | 87 | 114 | 152 | 190 | 236 | 289 | 262 | 213 | 156 | 255 |
| Percent Change | 1.6% | 2.3% | 2.9% | 3.4% | 4.4% | 5.4% | 4.7% | 3.7% | 2.9% | 4.6% |
| Government Payments | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 933 | 843 | 775 | 775 | 698 | 669 | 606 | 507 | 805 | 594 |
| GATT Scenario | 919 | 796 | 690 | 663 | 656 | 658 | 538 | 427 | 745 | 541 |
| Change | -14 | -47 | -85 | -112 | -42 | -11 | -68 | -80 | -60 | -53 |
| Percent Change | -1.5% | -5.6% | -11.0% | -14.5% | -6.0% | -1.6% | -11.2% | -15.8% | -7.5% | -8.9% |
| Other Income | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 456 | 431 | 443 | 457 | 445 | 435 | 449 | 463 | 446 | 449 |
| GATT Scenario | 462 | 442 | 460 | 478 | 471 | 467 | 480 | 495 | 462 | 481 |
| Change | 6 | 11 | 17 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 31 | 32 | 16 | 31 |
| Percent Change | 1.3% | 2.5% | 3.8% | 4.7% | 5.8% | 7.2% | 7.0% | 6.8% | 3.6% | 7.0% |
| Production Expenses | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 9725 | 9814 | 10060 | 10246 | 10491 | 10744 | 10961 | 11199 | 10067 | 10968 |
| GATT Scenario | 9739 | 9856 | 10135 | 10343 | 10690 | 10917 | 11174 | 11420 | 10153 | 11170 |
| Change | 14 | 42 | 75 | 98 | 199 | 173 | 213 | 221 | 85 | 202 |
| Percent Change | 0.1% | 0.4% | 0.7% | 1.0% | 1.9% | 1.6% | 1.9% | 2.0% | 0.8% | 1.8% |
| Value of Inventory Change | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | -28 | 15 | -60 | -16 | 70 | 6 | -17 | -44 | -4 | -18 |
| GATT Scenario | -26 | 19 | -55 | -5 | 137 | 15 | 16 | -36 | 14 | -2 |
| Change | 2 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 68 | 8 | 33 | 8 | 18 | 16 |

Table A.4. Continued.

| | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 95-99 Avg | 00-02 Avg |
|------------------------|-------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-----------|
| | (Million Dollars) | | | | | | | | | |
| Net Cash Income | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 2635 | 2189 | 2149 | 2238 | 1906 | 1651 | 1730 | 1818 | 2223 | 1733 |
| GATT Scenario | 2714 | 2298 | 2294 | 2422 | 2129 | 1994 | 2031 | 2102 | 2372 | 2042 |
| Change | 79 | 109 | 146 | 184 | 223 | 343 | 302 | 284 | 148 | 310 |
| Percent Change | 3.0% | 5.0% | 6.8% | 8.2% | 11.7% | 20.8% | 17.4% | 15.6% | 6.7% | 17.9% |
| Net Farm Income | | | | | | | | | | |
| Baseline | 1813 | 1350 | 1254 | 1429 | 1163 | 821 | 922 | 1013 | 1402 | 919 |
| GATT Scenario | 1899 | 1469 | 1413 | 1633 | 1417 | 1139 | 1198 | 1238 | 1566 | 1192 |
| Change | 86 | 120 | 159 | 204 | 255 | 318 | 275 | 226 | 165 | 273 |
| Percent Change | 4.7% | 8.9% | 12.6% | 14.3% | 21.9% | 38.7% | 29.9% | 22.3% | 11.7% | 29.7% |