enough to be a key factor in establishing local prices for products. These prices may be entirely fictitious—with the corporation making up for losses in other aspects of its operation. Poultry corporations can make up for losses at the farm by receiving a high price for feed, or by setting the price it sells dressed chickens for at the supermarket. Indeed, it might be said that the only meaningful price in the entire operation is at the grocery counter—whether the product is meat or vegetables or frozen orange juice.

The National Commission on Food Marketing, a Presidential commission, warned in 1966 that "powerful buyers" are interfering with the free market.

As an example, may I quote from the National Observer on January 29, 1968: "The rugged proudly independent western cattleman may soon become as much of a relic of American history as the Plains Indian and the buffalo," said the Observer. It continued with a report from Sturgis, South Dakota telling how supermarkets that sell 85 percent of the red meat consumed in the United States pay producers artificially low prices while charging artificially high prices to consumers. The farmers were holding meetings about the situation. And through their organization—the Independent Stockgrowers of America—they were instrumental in the filing of an antitrust suit in San Francisco charging the Nation's three largest supermarket chains with conspiring to fix meat prices. Named in the action were A & P, Safeway, and Kroger.

Another market value that the corporation farms interfere with is land values. The Gates Rubber Company has been buying land at a rapid rate in the Yuma County, Colorado area. The exact acreage is not known because some secrecy surrounds the company's operations and motives. But Edgar J. Lengel of Burlington, Colorado said in a letter to the *Denver Post* on December 31, 1967 that the result of the Gates buying activity was that land values had gone so high in the area that local farmers were unable to expand operations. And others, Mr. Tengel said, who want to gain a foothold in farming are being forced out of agriculture because "Gates has set land values so high in the area the local farmers cannot afford it."

A matter of special concern to us all is that many corporations have gone into farming, and their losses are written off against profits in some other enterprise. In fact, the Internal Revenue Service reported that in 1965, 119 individuals with incomes of more than $1,000,000 were engaged in farming. One hundred and three of them lost money in their farming operations.

How much is this kind of thing costing the Nation? Some rather shocking figures are available. When Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana looked into the matter, he found 31 of the 100 largest metropolitan areas reported net tax losses from farming. Four metropolitan areas in California reported a net loss of $60 million. Four metropolitan areas in Texas reported a collective net loss in excess of $40 million. These were all absentee farmers, many of them using these losses to reduce the amount of taxes they owed on other enterprises.

Recent occurrences in our major cities make it unnecessary to remind you that our ghettos are filled with people who have been displaced from the rural areas of our Nation.

Last October 21, the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* reported in some detail on a "cowtel" financed by an out-of-state investor. This elaborately equipped installation keeps 110 cows in total confinement, the newspaper said. It is operated by a 25-year-old manager, and his younger brother. Two other such installations are located at Fort Madison and Mount Pleasant, Iowa, the newspaper reported.

Earlier last year, it was reported that an Oklahoma corporation invited 200 representatives of 90 leading companies to "brainstorm" on how their corporations might move into the open fields.

They visualized giant "hothouses," pushbutton irrigation, photosensitive skyroofs to flood interiors with sunlight, buildings spanning thousands of acres using conveyor belts and electric tractors, and vegetable farms with their own canning and freezing operations under the same roof as the farm.

I invite you to ponder this "vision" of tomorrow, along with the forecast of Lawrence G. Chait, president of a New York City advertising and sales consulting firm that "the 200 largest firms in the United States could control two-thirds of all manufacturing assets by 1975," and recent articles in such magazines as *Business Week* urging businessmen to consider farm investment for tax write-offs, weekending, and/or retirement.

Not all the population loss is from the farms themselves, of course. Suffering equally are the small towns. One of the most exhaustive studies of the effects