

The Farm Bill – Standalone or via Reconciliation?

Roger McEowen (roger.mceowen@washburn.edu) – Washburn University School of Law
Ag Law and Taxation Blog: <https://agriculturallaw.lawprofessorsblogs.com/>

May 2026

Overview

Is it really necessary to have a Farm Bill rather than the way it was done via reconciliation under the OBBBA and with ad hoc disaster payments added after-the-fact when deemed necessary? What are the pros and cons? The question of whether a traditional, multi-year Farm Bill is a constitutional necessity or merely an outdated artifact of legislative compromise - as opposed to a model of targeted reconciliation and ad hoc assistance - is one of the most critical debates in current agricultural policy. The answer turns on the tension between structural stability and fiscal discipline.

To analyze this, the *process* of lawmaking must be separated from the *outcome* of the policy.

The Case for the Traditional Farm Bill: Statutory Certainty

From a legal and economic standpoint, the primary benefit of a traditional Farm Bill is the establishment of a long-term regulatory and subsidy framework. In agriculture, capital investment decisions - land acquisition, equipment upgrades, and multi-year production strategies - are predicated on the predictability of the legislative environment.

- **Market Stability:** When farmers know the rules for the next five years, they can plan. A statutory framework provides the "baseline" against which producers and lenders measure risk.
- **The "Regular Order" Defense:** While messy, the legislative process of a Farm Bill theoretically subjects policy to committee hearings, public testimony, and floor debate. This is the constitutional design for transparency and accountability.
- **The "Logroll" Paradox:** Critics often deride the coupling of nutrition (SNAP) and commodity programs as inefficient. However, from a legislative strategy perspective, this "logroll" is what facilitates the passage of agricultural policy in a diverse Congress.

The Case for Reconciliation and Ad Hoc Payments

The move toward using reconciliation (as seen in the OBBBA of 2025) and ad hoc disaster payments represents a shift toward a more centralized, reactive governance model.

- **Legislative Efficiency:** Reconciliation allows the majority party to bypass the Senate filibuster, enabling the passage of complex tax and spending provisions that would otherwise be deadlocked. It is a tool of convenience that prioritizes output over broad consensus.
- **Reactive Precision:** Ad hoc disaster payments (e.g., WHIP+ or ERP iterations) can be tailored to specific, acute events (like the weather volatility of the past few years). They do not require the massive, omnibus reauthorization of entire titles of the Farm Bill.



Comparison Table

Feature	Traditional Farm Bill	Reconciliation + Ad Hoc Approach
Predictability	High (Multi-year horizon)	Low (Dependent on legislative whims)
Fiscal Impact	Transparent, budgeted in advance	Often unbudgeted, deficit-driving
Constitutional Order	Deliberative, Committee-driven	Centralized, Leadership-driven
Market Signal	Consistent baseline	Distorts signals (producers wait for checks)
Accountability	Clearer legislative intent	Increased administrative discretion

Bottom Line

The shift toward a reliance on ad hoc payments and reconciliation is fundamentally concerning for several reasons:

- **The Erosion of Fiscal Discipline.** Ad hoc payments operate outside of the standard budget scoring process. Because they are not pre-authorized, they frequently bypass the spending caps that are intended to keep the federal deficit in check. This is, in essence, "governing by crisis." It allows the executive branch or congressional leadership to steer funds to specific districts or interest groups without the discipline of the appropriations process.
- **The Rise of "Administrative Rent-Seeking."** When payments are ad hoc, the eligibility criteria are often defined by administrative rulemaking rather than firm statutory language. This shifts power from the legislative branch (Congress) to the executive branch (USDA/FSA). It also forces agricultural producers to become lobbyists, constantly seeking the next round of "emergency" funding rather than focusing on market-based risk management or actuarially sound crop insurance.
- **Market Distortion.** Perhaps the most damaging aspect of the ad hoc model is the distortion of market signals. If a producer believes a disaster payment is imminent regardless of their risk management or crop insurance choices, the incentive to participate in the private insurance market diminishes. This creates a cycle of dependency where the federal government becomes the "insurer of first resort," a role it is ill-equipped to perform.



Conclusion

Is a traditional Farm Bill "necessary"? If the goal is a functioning, market-oriented agricultural sector that minimizes federal interference, yes.

The Farm Bill, for all its flaws, remains the most effective mechanism for codifying agricultural policy into law. It forces compromise, requires long-term fiscal planning, and limits the ability of the executive branch to manipulate the market via discretionary ad hoc payments. The trend toward reconciliation and ad hoc intervention is efficient in the short term, but it is dangerous in the long term; it hollows out the legislative process, destroys fiscal constraints, and ultimately replaces a stable regulatory environment with a regime of political favor-seeking.

For more information about this publication and others, visit [AgManager.info](https://www.agmanager.info).

K-State Agricultural Economics | 342 Waters Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506-4011 | www.ageconomics.k-state.edu

[Copyright 2026: AgManager.info](https://www.agmanager.info) and [K-State Department of Agricultural Economics](https://www.ageconomics.k-state.edu)

