There is evidence that the water table in the Ogalalla Reservoir that lies beneath the farmland of the Gates Rubber Company in the vicinity of Joes, Colorado is going down at an alarming rate. Gates was reported buying land on the basis of the flow of gallons of water per minute. Farms where the flow was too slow were rejected.

And there is competition involved. The *Yuma* (Colo.) *Pioneer* reported on October 5, 1967 that two small farmers had water well permits turned down because their land was situated among already heavily developed corporation interests.

I cannot overemphasize the urgency of the situation. The corporate invasion is moving at an unprecedented rate. Let me name just a few of our leading corporations, not mentioned heretofore, that have entered farming—CBK, Inc. of Kansas City, a giant corporation that has begun a five-year program to divest itself of all manufacturing and distribution operations and has announced that it will farm 80,000 acres of purchased and leased land from the Mexican border to the Canadian border. (Incidentially, as a result it reported losses of $3,605,-715 during the first nine months of 1967—compared to earnings of $410,853 during the same period of the previous year.)

Here are others: Pacific-Gamble-Robinson Company, a large grocery chain headquartered at Seattle; the Jewel Tea Company; Gulf and Western; Del Monte; H. J. Heinz; American Cyanimid; International Systems and Controls Corporation; the Goodyear Rubber Company and there are many more.

In Beadle County, South Dakota, the assessor—who did not believe there were very many corporations farming in his county—found there were 49 different farm operations owned by non-farm interests outside the county. In January of this year, the South Dakota Farmers Union looked into the situation, and found that 1,633,529 acres of land are now in corporate farms in their state—an area equal to the area of five counties!

There is growing concern over the situation.

The editor of the *Wellington* (Kansas) *Daily News* was moved to comment last October 24:

"The thought of one giant corporation controlling all of the agricultural wealth of Sumner County would provide a lifetime of nightmares for our merchants. Small town insurance firms wouldnt' have anyone to insure. Realtors wouldn't have anything to sell to anyone. Implement dealers could forget it. Petroleum dealers would go out of business or out of town, or like most of us, both."

Just last month, Representative James P. Buchele of Topeka, Kansas said "corporation farming has nothing to offer Kansas but loss of population."

A poll early this month in North Dakota showed that 82 percent of the people oppose corporation farming.

Not everybody is concerned, of course. On January 25 this year, for example, H. G. E. Fick, president of the Doane Agricultural Service, issued a news release saying there is "no cause for alarm over corporation farming."

A footnote to this comment appeared in the May 5, 1968 issue of the *New York Times*, describing a new farming venture—mutual fund types of investment firms to acquire diversified farming properties. One such firm is Doane Landco, Inc., 8900 Manchester Road, St. Louis, a subsidiary of Doane Agricultural Service, Inc. The *Times* reported that a similar cattle raising investment firm is Oppenheimer Industries, Inc., 353 East 53rd Street, New York City.

I have described our concerns about this alarming and pressing problem. What can be done?

In summary, I would say that we must now to strengthen the family farmer in our society so that he can survive, and compete with other segments of the economy.

The Agriculture Act of 1965 should be extended and made permanent, as President Johnson has suggested.

We support collective bargaining for farmers, as provided for in Senator Walter Mondale's bill.

We believe that legislation should be passed to establish strategic reserves of farm commodities, which will constitute a National Food and Fiber Reserve.

We must protect the family farm. We should explore graduated direct payments in order to give the family farm the extra protection it needs. There needs to be a limitation of payments based on a county-by-county determination as to what constitutes an average commercial family farm.