of corporation farming was made some 20 years ago by Walter Goldschmidt. He studies two towns in California—Arvin, a town serving a corporate farming area, and Dinuba, serving an area of family farms.

Dinuba, the small farm community, served 62 separate business establishments, compared to 35 in the large-farm city of Arvin. The volume of retail trade in the small-farm community during the 12-month period was $4,383,000 as against only $2,535,000 in the large-farm community.

Why did this occur?

Recent events tell us much. The Des Moines Register has reported extensively in recent months on a new corporation farming venture in Sac County, Iowa. Two of the three directors of the operation—Shinrone, Inc.—are William Oldfield Bridge and his wife. Incidentally, according to the *Des Moines Tribune* on March 18, 1968, Mr. Bridge—a Michigan truck company executive—settled a $598,398 tax bill to the Federal Government for $110,000 just 11 weeks before Shinrone, Inc. purchased this 6,000-acre farm valued by neighbors at around $3 million.

On March 17, 1968, the *Des Moines Sunday Register* reported that Shinrone had bought $250,000 worth of farm equipment—all of it painted white, by the way—from manufacturing plants at Detroit, Brantford, Canada, and Algoma, Wisconsin. Local farm implement dealers in the town that is bounded on two sides by Shinrone, Inc. must have been disappointed.

Reports in Colorado are that in some cases the big corporation farms, dealing directly with the factory, play off local dealers against each other so that low bids leave little or no profit.

John A. Hopkin, professor of agricultural finance at the University of Illinois, says candidly that the big corporate farms "will either be closely linked with certain suppliers, or they will set up their own supply subsidiaries."

Not all of the displaced people of the farms and in the small towns find their way to the cities, of course. Many of them remain—not as a Gates Rubber Company executive said, "living on their rocking-chair earnings" after selling out to Gates—but on welfare.

There is a need for some seasonal labor in some of the corporate operations, of course. And these people work when needed. Out of season they are on the welfare roles, just as many of their former neighbors are on the welfare roles in the great cities of our land.

To my knowledge, nobody has estimated how much this welfare "subsidy" costs this Nation, but it must be a very large amount of taxpayer dollars.

We in the National Farmers Union have been painfully aware of the declining population in rural America. There are fewer of us going to the polls. Some would have us believe that the welfare of the Nation is less involved, therefore, with the health of our agricultural establishment. One effect then of the decline of population on farms is that it makes it more difficult to balance our national purpose.

I have now discussed three of the five points I referred to at the beginning of my statement—interference and manipulation of the market, the loss of taxes; and depletion of the resources and strength of rural America.

I do not want to suggest that these are the three worst effects of the corporate invasion of rural America, because the two remaining areas of concern are equally important.

In Arkansas—and other southern states—lumber and paper companies own thousands of acres of timber land. Their holdings sometimes cover most of entire counties. Trees—cut selectively on most of these holdings—provide the cover that protects the topsoil and forms the watersheds. We have reports that some of the companies—under the pressure of the demand for profits and in order to pay off high initial investments—are following a "deep cutting" policy. This, of course, is leaving the land less protected than it was when they came on the scene.

We all know the practice in some corporations of letting buildings go unpainted, machinery unrepaired, and permitting other resources of the corporation to depreciate without adequate maintenance, in order that immediate profits are increased. I do not approve of this practice in any corporation. But do we dare permit corporations—with the impersonal pressures that sometimes descend upon management for profits—to come into possession of our natural resources?

A cut-over timber stand can expose the land to a rainstorm that can take an inch of topsoil in a single night—topsoil that might require 700 years to replace.