increase the problems of our already too crowded cities. In addition, the possibility of monopoly control of American agriculture by giant farming corporations poses a direct threat to all consumers as well.

There are many commonly held assumptions about the impact of corporation farming. These are based on facts that document the effects of the current technological revolution in agriculture, as well as the lack of adequate farm income.

The report of the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber (July 1967) summarizes this dilemma:

"Aggregate income from farming tells only part of the story of the broader concept of rural well-being. It omits some of the important aspects of personal and family income distribution; it neglects the necessarily close interrelationship between farm and other rural and smalltown persons. . . . (p. 197)

"About 30 percent of the U.S. population is in rural areas—and most of these rural people are at a disadvantage compared with their urban cousins. The disadvantage shows up most clearly in lower incomes, but it can also be readily seen in the other economic indicators: Reduced government services at higher costs per person, fewer job opportunities at lower wages, and shorter and poorer schooling. Even if the rural resident decides to migrate to a city, he may still find himself at an educational disadvantage, and being new to urban life, he is less equipped to compete in the urban labor market. He is usually the last hired and the first fired. . . . (p. 197)

"One indication of the disadvantage of the rural resident is the continuing out-migration from rural areas. Usually, the emigrants are the young people—who not only represent the area's best hopes for the future, but also carry with them a considerable investment by the rural area in education and training. . . . (p. 198)

". . . Farm residents have only 79 percent of the school attainment of rural residents. When quality of education—in terms of the variety of courses offered, remedial courses, courses for handicapped children, and the use of modern educational technology—is included this percentage of disadvantage would be undoubtedly more pronounced. . . . (p. 210)

"Lower rural expenditures for community services do not mean that rural areas have adequate government service and public utilities. Specifically health, hospital, medical, and sanitation facilities are poorer than those in urban areas. . . . (p. 212)

"There is great need to upgrade the quality of local public service in rural areas. . . ." (p. 217)

The Commission's findings point out the serious problems already facing rural communities It is commonly believed that because corporation farms frequently employ seasonal, transient labor, they increase local employment problems, add to the school load and adversely affect social institutions, such as civic clubs, fraternal organizations and churches. In addition, their large-scale purchases tend to bypass the local businessmen and services usually furnished in the community are obtained from corporate headquarters or in other areas.

Thus the conclusion must be that a corporate farm economy would cause the disappearance of even some of the larger more prosperous towns and trading centers in rural America. This would further erode the quality of living in the country by increasing the migration of underemployed and unemployed people to the large cities where they are ill equipped to take their place in society as productive Americans.

There are some that say artificial restrictions on the entry of corporations into farming would reduce the efficiency of agriculture in the United States. The implication is that corporate-type agriculture is more efficient than our family farm system. There are few facts to document this view. The basic problem is that our agriculture is already too efficient. It can produce far more than the market can absorb at fair farm prices. Therefore we don't need to encourage corporation farming as a matter of public policy, in order to produce more food and fiber.

A reasonable appraisal of the situation seems to indicate that the rapid rise in the number of corporation farms is already, in fact, the result of an artificial situation. The tax regulations that allow the writeoff of farm losses against nonfarm corporate income does stimulate farm investment with cheap dollars—something the family farmer can't do. In addition, the present regulations encourage corporate land speculation, to the detriment of both farmers and rural communities.