

\$15,000 to \$20,000—Of 66,003 involved in farming, 42,160 showed a profit and 23,843 reported a loss.

\$10,000 to \$15,000—Of 211,673 involved in farming, 132,109 reported a profit and 79,564 reported a loss.

\$5,000 to \$10,000—Of the 793,689 involved in farming, 473,948 reported a profit and 319,741 reported a loss.

I think these figures point out the two major reasons non-farm interest, and especially corporations, are entering farming:

(1) Land has been a good investment, increasing nationally at the rate of five percent or more annually.

(2) To give these non-farm interests a tax advantage through their farming operations.

A great majority of the people in our state, I am sure, want to see our present independently owned farm and trade center pattern continued, and are alarmed at the increasing entrance into agriculture by corporations and other non-farm interests.

When these outfits are trying to lose money, it makes pretty tough and pretty unfair competition for a farm family trying to make a living at farming.

In addition, corporations, in general, do not make good Main Street customers or good neighbors. They contribute little to a community in the way of church or school endeavors and they also are making it extremely difficult for young farmers to get started in farming or to expand their present farm unit to an adequate size because the giant corporate farms are generally able and willing to pay more than the going price to get what they want.

When corporation farming comes in, farm families move out and they are replaced by the inevitable seasonal worker with the accompanying welfare and educational problems.

To illustrate this point, I call your attention to a report by a special committee to study problems of American Small Business, created by the 79th Congress.

The committee studied two communities in California in areas of equal productivity—Arvin and Dinuba. They differed only in the type of agriculture they served. Arvin was in a large, corporate farm area and Dinuba in a family farm area.

The contrast in these two towns was striking. Arvin was governed from the county seat and had unimproved streets, poor housing, one elementary school, few stores or service clubs, and virtually no home furnishing, lumber, hardware and farm equipment businesses. Dinuba, in the family farm area, had paved streets, water and sewer, three elementary schools plus a high school, 35 service clubs and social organizations, permanent churches and numerous durable goods stores.

The exodus of our farm people, triggered by low farm prices and this corporate farm onrush, has produced economic and social decay in small towns and cities throughout the nation.

You can drive almost anywhere in the rural areas and see the results of our failure to weigh social consequences in determining our economic objectives: the weathered, abandoned farm house, a curtain flapping through a broken window; the soaped-up plate glass of the store front with the "Closed" sign taped to the door; the weeds standing tall around the vacant service station, and the growing ratio of older people on our main streets in areas like South Dakota.

It has had an equally depressing effect upon our cities. It has compounded existing conditions of congestion, pollution, tension, unemployment and despair, and added to the problems of already problem-ridden urban officials.

You need look no farther than your local newspaper or television screen to see what this incredible pile-up of people has meant—riots, fires, killing, looting—the instruments of desperate people, crowded, with no hope, into the ghettos of our metropolitan cities.

If the traditional independent farm family is to regain control of American agriculture, the first order of business should be to free them from this unfair competition with corporation farms, and to provide them with better and stronger programs so that they can make a living on the land.

Stanley Andrews, Alamo, Texas, a member of the National Advisory Committee on Rural Development, also believes it is time that some thought was given