rural America. It will deplete its resources—its land, water, and people—and it will put the city dwellers of America at the mercy of a monopoly controlling the cost of food and clothing—things it cannot postpone buying.

I would like to discuss five points:

1. The corporation farm interferes with the market system that exists for farm commodities.

2. The corporation farm cheats us of our taxes—by operating frequently on tax writeoffs from profits in other fields, and by practices at the farm level that cut local and States taxes.

3. The corporation farm results in a decline of population in rural areas, a depleting of community resources in small towns, contributing to the problems of already overcrowded cities, and further diminishing the welfare of rural America by diminishing its political influence.

4. There is evidence that the corporation farm—with its impersonal pressures on management for quick profits—cannot be trusted with our basic natural resources—soil and water.

5. There is urgency in the matter. It is already very late.

Without help, the farmer is powerless to stop the corporate invasion. He is weakened by a farm program that at best has only prevented utter disaster to his segment of the economy, and parenthetically, Mr. Chairman, as you well know, Farmers Union is a strong proponent of the farm program. Without it we would have chaos in agriculture. The 1965 act is a very fine act. We are seeking its improvement and its extension. It has not been funded properly. It has been funded inadequately to provide the kind of income that's needed. The farmer is denied the right to participate in the setting of most of the prices he receives. He is at the mercy of other segments of the economy which are protected and strengthened by Government programs. The farmer is no match economically for his foe. He needs the help of his State and Federal Governments.

Before entering the discussion of the five points mentioned above, I would like to challenge one myth that has been spread across America—frequently by the public relations departments of the giant corporations. That myth concerns the so-called efficiency of corporation farms.

I say this to you without qualification. There is no relationship whatever between efficiency and corporation farming. There is perhaps a relationship between efficiency and size of operation, but only up to a point. After that it diminishes quite sharply. And that point is well within the scope possible for family-type farms. That is, a 3,000-acre farm is not necessarily more efficient than a 300-acre farm. In fact, the 300-acre unit operated by a family whose roots are deep in the soil may be a good deal more efficient than its corporate neighbor of 3,000 or 30,000 acres. In your fine State of Wisconsin, Mr. Chairman, the University of Wisconsin has come out with a number of studies, and one in particular which shows that an independent farm operator that is well equipped can make the best return on his investment. In Texas, this is true in cotton. We have found that an independent owner-operator, properly equipped, can make the best return on a cotton farm and that larger farms nearby are not getting the same kind of return.

Senator NELSON. May I interrupt here for just a moment? On page 2 in item 4 you made the comment that the management of these corpo-