agement so that exactly the opposite of the stated goals was attained—a drop in farm prices.

At the same time, the council justifies the rise in automobile prices and in cotton textiles, even though "a sharp decline" in the cost of raw cotton would have suggested price reductions.

This was justified on the basis of the excess demand for these consumer goods, precisely the factor pushing up the price of bacon and steaks to such unreasonable heights so rapidly in the early part of 1966. At the same time it admits that "in general terms, the greatest failure of observance of price guideposts lies in the failure to reduce prices on a considerable number of the product lines of a large number of industries." As chapter 3 has indicated, "a number of the price increases that have occurred in manufacturer and the mining industries undoubtedly had some justification in higher costs. But offsetting price decreases have been far too few" (page 125).

We would close these comments on the direct statements of the council by using only two more. On page 128, they stated in relationship to "recognition of higher living costs":

> The only valid and noninflationary standard for wage advances is the productivity principle. If price stability is eventually to be restored and maintained in a high-employment U.S. economy, wage settlements must once again conform to that standard.

And on page 129:

> But the higher minimum wage effective in 1967 will have its principal impact on wages in the unorganized sectors, and in the largely unorganized low-wage segments of manufacturing. Thus there will be some continued pressure on costs and prices originating in wage increases outside of the organized sectors.

This, to us, means agriculture.

The thrust of our argument should be apparent by now. Agriculture has not kept pace with the rest of the economy, except for a very short period of time during 1965–66. The depressing effects of governmental policy on agricultural prices was not matched by equally effective policy in the nonagricultural sector.

Stable farm prices, even in the midst of highly and rapidly increasing farm costs, seems to be a desirable objective in terms of the council's report. The equality of income principle, permitting low-income groups to increase their prices (wages) faster than the high-income groups is denied to the agricultural sector. The reduced purchasing power of American farmers places them in a less competitive position in bidding for, not only labor, but for the land upon which they live, with a direct threat to our owner-operator type of agriculture.

No suggestions were made by the council for alleviating the economic problems facing agriculture, even the recognition of the place that farm programs have had in maintaining income at a level which it has been for the last few years.

In the midst of a growing drive toward the removal of exceptions which have protected agriculture from increased costs, it is increasingly imperative that agriculture share equally in the returns of the American economic system. To weaken the financial stability of agriculture and to weaken the American system of agricultural production by a change into a corporate farm or a socialistic structure which has basically the same results for those working on the land, that is the denying of a share of the profits they create, poses a grave threat to