

some experience with this in the National Grange, and we have distributed copies of this book "Success Unlimited" for the members of the committee.

During the last 10 years, the National Grange, in cooperation with the Sears-Roebuck Foundation has distributed prize money for community service projects to the amount of one million and a half dollars. The best of our information is that we have generated in rural communities a capital investment of 10 times that amount, a billion and a half dollars. We are proud of this. But we do not believe we can solve this problem this way. We can solve part of it, but the problem is too big for us or any other private charity or philanthropic group to solve.

In terms of title III in the grants, it was the feeling of the Executive Committee of the National Grange that as far as possible this type of assistance should be given in a loan instead of a grant, recognizing that there are times when grants are the only way, the only practical way out; but in general we believe that the interests of the recipient would be better served if long-term, nonrecourse loans that could be written off, but which at the time they were made and as long as possible would give the person who received them an opportunity to repay them, maintaining this self-respect. We believe this would be a better way when possible.

That means that the Farmers Home Administration lending programs would have to be broadened. It would mean that, in our judgment, Congress would have to approve funds, to appropriate funds for the writeoff of some of this type of loan. But as far as possible, we would prefer going that direction without at the same time, as I mentioned, objecting in toto to the grants part of this bill.

Over in the last section, section 303, which deals with the land reform, we recognize that probably this is the only way that we are going to get some of this land out of the large land holdings back into the family owner-operator farm situation. It is unfortunate that sometimes this extra outside money that is involved in agriculture expansion or in the concentration of agricultural production in large units and is done through the capital gains advantages of our tax laws, have simply built up economic units that are so large that no family farmer, no owner-operator could, under any stretch of the imagination, ever be able to buy that unit.

There is not that much credit available anywhere from any source to purchase that kind of land. Now our hesitancy at this point is, we think we should take a good long, hard look at this one, that this does not become a land reform program in disguise. By that I mean that we do not yet, it seems to us, have sufficiently established a policy concerning land reform to embark too far on this without establishing policy.

Now the example that I want to use is this. If there is a large holding of land under corporate ownership, who is to judge whether or not the Federal Government should acquire that land and redistribute it? This is a very serious question. Now if the land comes on the market, this becomes an entirely different thing. If the land is on the market to settle an estate, or something of that kind, then I think the Federal Government, through this kind of program, should probably move into this situation and try to reestablish the type of agricultural program which has been the American pattern.