

Dr. BISHOP. For rural youth who will migrate. Let us make one more point here. The income differential between farm and nonfarm vocations is so large for most people that we are going to continue to have a lot of migration from our farms. This is going to be very heavy during this decade, especially if we achieve a reduction in the level of unemployment which is a first and foremost planning in any attack on poverty or any attack on the farm problem as I see it, a move toward a more fully employed economy.

If we achieve this we are going to provide new job opportunities and we are going to have a great deal of migration from our farms. But my point is that unless these people have some kind of marketable skills, they are going to be human tragedies in our cities because they are not going to be employable there.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That still does not answer my question, Doctor, as to who is going to decide. What is the criterion for determining whether or not an individual should be given \$1,500, whether an individual should be given access to the acquisition of one of these redeveloped family farms or whether he should be permitted to leave for the city? Where do you draw the line and how do you set up the criteria?

Dr. BISHOP. I think the lines can be drawn in this way. If you are interested in developing economically viable units within agriculture, then we ought to ask the question, what size of farm, how much investment, what form of investment does it take with this type of farming for this person to get a return that would be comparable to what can be earned in nonfarm endeavors?

This would give us a handle on that one. On the migration question, the mobility question, there are various kinds of tests that can be rendered to people to determine the extent to which they are retrainable, the extent to which they might be successful in nonfarm vocations.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In other words, then, you are not suggesting that some third party is going to decide, let us assume that we have a man here who has been on a farm all his life. Now, he may have well wanted to move into the city, he has had it. You are not suggesting that somebody along the line can come and say, "No, you don't have a marketable product. You don't have a marketable trade. You have to stay on the farm." You are not suggesting that, are you?

Dr. BISHOP. Indeed not.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Conversely, supposing that a man who has lived on a farm all his life and has lived in poverty now says, "If I had \$1,500 to buy some seed and if I had a little plot of my own, I know that with my experience and the experience I gained from my father and grandfather, I could make a go on this farm." Are you suggesting that somebody in the Department of Agriculture is going to analyze this and they are going to decide whether he is right or wrong?

Dr. BISHOP. I would say that there are people in the Department of Agriculture who can help him to decide whether this is possible or not.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is exactly what worries me about title III. Mr. Freeman was here before the committee and we discussed title III at great length and we agreed that the Department of Agriculture now has many things.

They have the FHA over there for credit-risk farms, and assistance on loans. What happens is that the people in Washington seem to get out of touch with reality and they set up criteria that very fre-