

Let's turn to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and I would suspect that in part the existence of this committee and the reason for its concern stems from some of the utterances of the Department, but I think one of the publications that the Department put out recently, entitled "Agriculture/2000," makes reference to the climate that we have developed in this country that provides for growth and development of corporation farming, and they state:

Today that farmer is seriously underpaid—and this cannot long continue. In a full employment, free enterprise economy such as ours, capital and know-how will go elsewhere if they are unrewarded in agriculture. If this happens—if the family farm system is wrecked and monopoly agriculture develops in the United States—the bright promise we predict today for the year 2000 may well be lost.

This is primary. The system of agriculture that we enjoy today, with ownership, decision-making, responsibility and rewards widely dispersed, in many hands, rather than in just a few, is the most efficient, most productive in the entire world.

And they go on to state many other things.

They conclude by saying: "Both consumers and family farmers should be aware of this threat."

Next, there was an independent study by the National Commission on Food Marketing, and in June of that year, this rather voluminous report was published in June of 1966, and I think part of the study stated as follows:

The bulk of agricultural production still comes from family farms (in the sense that they employ no more hired than family labor) but some types of production, especially fruit and vegetable production, have moved, to a large extent, out of the family farm class.

Now, here is the key phrase:

Probably a selective shift will continue, with the types of farming predominating in the Midwest, East, and parts of the South being among the last to make the shift.

Of course I interpret this statement as looking toward the eventual demise of the family farm.

Now I would like to move to the controversial area that appears to exist among the representatives of the educational estate. I think John Galbraith's view is appropriate, and he states:

Economists, on the whole, think well of what they do themselves and much less of what their professional colleagues do. If a scholar probes deeply into a small section of the subject, he is fairly certain to mistrust, as superficial, the man who ranges more widely. The latter, in turn, will think the specialist lacking in vision or what is called reach. By knowing even more about even less, he will seem to risk becoming quite ignorant. Those who are mathematically inclined to see others as in retreat from rigor. The others think those who manipulate symbols impractical.

He concludes:

It is exceedingly fortunate for the psychic health of the profession that inadequacy lies so uniformly with others.

Paul Farris from Purdue is concerned. He said: "Farmers today are much concerned about the future organization of agriculture. Their loss of managerial independence is disintegrating the family farm in ways not fully visible from trends in farm numbers and sizes." He goes on to make quite an elaborate report on his observations and on the current trend in agriculture.