Then let's contrast that Purdue statement with the view from Wisconsin. The University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture and Life Sciences issued a report in August 1967, prepared by a special faculty task force. It was a comprehensive study concerning the kind of agriculture we are likely to have in 1980. The task force concluded as follows:

> The family farm in animal agriculture will continue as the basic unit in Wisconsin. Farming in this country is not trending toward the large corporate unit either in numbers or in proportion of the market (p. 19 of report).
>
> Family farms will continue as the basic format in Wisconsin. However, each family unit will need to continue to increase considerably in size and efficiency. To operate large units with the same or even less labor, more of the inputs will need to be purchased (p. 71 of report).

To this last statement many Wisconsin farmers respond, "How do we share in this increased efficiency? Most of it has been passed on to the consumer. We seem to be getting less and less as our efficiency improves." I cite this as two examples of contrast.

Then I am sure you are familiar, Senator, with the National Advisory Committee on Food and Fiber report. In January of 1966 they issued that document, and on page 159 they state:

> There is no indication that extremely large-scale corporate farming will take over American farming in the near future. Mainly, it appears that the family farm will continue to get larger, as it has in the past. The traditional family farm is simply getting larger because the family and an equal amount of hired labor can handle a larger unit efficiently with modern methods and machines and lower their unit costs by doing so.

Perhaps we have already belabored this point but we believe that the forces at work, forces now compared to 1946 when the Arvin-Dinuba study was made, are undoubtedly different. I think even in the short period since the time of the House of Representatives, the 88th Congress, viewed the family farm issue via their Committee on Agriculture back in 1963, conditions have changed substantially. I think some of this indication was in Dr. Raup's statistics that he cited earlier.

Now, if we can make one point it would be, now is the time to determine what kind of socioeconomic structure we want for our agricultural sector of this country. There are now many straws in the wind regarding the potential strong thrust that could be made by huge corporate interests in assuming major control of the agricultural plant. Is this in the public interest? Let's not wait until the horse is stolen before we lock the barn.

As a point of clarification, I don't want to say that the big corporation is a rampant ogre coldly coveting the agriculture plant of this country. In most instances their control over the decisionmaking process in other areas of our economy has come without intent and is a result of the economic and social framework within which they operate.

Now, the council believes we are witnessing the beginning of a trend in a drive toward diversification and formation of conglomerates has a favorable climate to flourish in agriculture. I think a lot of these items were mentioned earlier this morning, tax structure, the waning influence in legislative halls, capital demands, and the cost-price squeeze.

Now, even our Government, while on the one hand expressing concern, acts to further aggravate the price-income situation. And here,