an increase in net farm income. In February 1966, he received a subsequent Economic Opportunity loan for $300. At that time he had five beef cows with calves and a registered bull. He had cleared 8 acres, and fertilized and seeded the land for pasture and had cross-fenced the area to control grazing.

Later in 1966 he obtained a regular FHA operating loan for $1,000 for 6 more cows with calves. This gave him a total of 15 cows and the registered bull. He then had 18 acres of permanent pasture crossfenced with access to water in each pasture. His herd this year produced 11 calves, the gross return from which was $985. In addition, he placed his cotton and corn acreage in the cropland diversion program. As a result, he receives $200 in payments yearly. His family also has developed their potential for producing vegetables and small fruits for home use to the extent that the garden they have now returns the equivalent of $300 a year in produce. The following is a comparison of Mr. Hamlin's yearly farm returns before and after he received the loan assistance:

BEFORE

Net income from row crops	$365
Estimated value of produce for family use	50
Total	415

AFTER

Net income from calf crop	$800
Estimated value of produce for family use	300
Cropland diversion payments	200
Total	1,300

Mr. Hamlin's conversion to a beef cattle enterprise although requiring considerable initial work to clear land and seed, fertilize, and fence pasture now enables him to work more time at off-the-farm jobs. As a result in 1966 he earned approximately $2,000 from work in a cotton gin and as a farm laborer.

In analyzing the impact of the EO loan on this borrower, two points are notable:

(1) The loan enabled him to tripe his net income from his farm by reorganizing his resources and converting from an extremely marginal row corp operation to livestock production, which is more suitable to his situation and resources. Although his income from farming remains very low and will probably never be sufficient to support his family, his farm serves both as a "homeplace" stabilizing family living and as the source of an important proportion of his total income.

(2) It was not possible for the Farmers Home Administration to supply all of the required financial assistance in this case without the EO loan program, since an adequate farm improvement and development plan, including the prospect of enough income to pay living expenses and meet debt payments, could not be worked out under the regular FHA operating and ownership loan program terms and conditions.

Mr. QUIE. To go to another subject, you mention on the bottom of page 5:

Scattered across this country more than 3,150 community resource development committees and 562 multicommittees are working today on job development and training, housing, health, education, recreation, and other services and facilities beneficial to rural communities.

Is this all inclusive, or are these USDA programs which you are speaking of here?

Secretary FREEMAN. These are lay programs in which USDA has played a part and participated, many of which were begun by the initial rural area development drive that we started in 1961. Many had their derivation from other beginnings and out of this has come a great many different kinds of citizen groups and committees working in a number of different areas.