to the consumer so that an effective monopoly will enable those who dominate the trade to extract whatever price they wish.

The second is to obtain an alternative source of supply of farm products so that they can draw on these supplies and for practical purposes place a ceiling on the price which they have to pay for farm products in the open market.

We hope that there will never be a monopoly in the food business that can get away with the kind of markup which has been found to prevail in some sectors of the drug manufacturing and wholesaling business. This simply would not be tolerable in the food business. The degree of concentration in the food business is already at a danger point. If control of the primary food production is allowed to get into the control of industry giants, both farmers and consumers could well be victimized. The delegates to the Minnesota Farmers Union convention representing something over 25,000 farm families at the convention in December 1967 had this paragraph on corporate superfarms, and I quote:

> Non-farm investment and industrial firms have indicated their intent to operate huge corporate farms in Minnesota and other states. The production of the corporate superfarms is not needed and will only create new excess capacity in addition to the already excessive capacity on family type farms.
>
> Both legislative and regulatory measures should be taken to prevent further invasion of major industrial and non-farm corporations into agricultural production.
>
> Whatever administrative or legislative steps may be needed to distinguish family farms in each county from corporate superfarms should be taken. Once the family-type farms have been designated, the principal benefit of the farm programs should be reflected to them and denied to the corporate superfarms.

That is the end of the quote.

In line with this last recommendation in our Farmers Union policy statement, a comparable provision appears in our National Farmers Union policy statement for 1968. I read this as follows:

> In the broad national interest, Congress is called upon to enact legislation to assure parity prices and income protection only on a family-farm level of production. In order to determine those farmers with a family-type operation, the U.S.D.A. should make a study directed to defining such farms on a county-by-county basis.

That is the end of the quote.

In addition, then, to designating of farms as family farms as suggested above, the owners of farms should be required to register with the county ASCS committee for the purpose of disclosure of the principal owner or owners. Once a farm has been registered it should be required that any change in the ownership be reported within 30 days of such a change. Registration would require name and address of the owner, size and location of the farm, date of acquisition, type of ownership, whether individual, partnership, or corporation. In case of corporate ownership, it should require a disclosure of persons owning more than a 5-percent interest and should also disclose whether the corporation has any business, other business related to agriculture, either in farm supplies or marketing or processing. If this was done, it would place on public record valuable information on farm ownership.

It is sometimes said that a hundred thousand farms could produce all the food and farm commodities which the Nation needs. This may