others, began to meet in Denver to see if something might be done in regard to the evident chain store monopoly.

I took part in several of these meetings. The ranchers there decided that they would raise some money for the necessary investigative purposes and hire an anti-trust law firm to file a pilot suit against several food chains for a redress of losses. And in this manner have a legal basis for corrective legislation in the Congress. I am sure that since this law suit has been filed and had made headlines that the food chains have loosened up a little bit with higher prices to livestock producers. But this is really a case for the Department of Justice and for the Congress, because ranchers do not have the time or the money to spend the rest of their lives in court.

I cannot see why Congress can't pass laws that will regulate the handlers of food and livestock so that, in the first place, the persons producing the livestock, either on the ranges or in the feed lots, will get a price sufficient to pay operating costs, interest on capital invested and a profit comparable to any other business. I say this because the United States is not a poor country like India, but the most productive agricultural country in the world. The public utilities are regulated, so are the railroads, the airlines, insurance companies and the like. Why not supermarkets, so they will not be in the business of "cattle rustling", legally or illegally, where the producer on the land is forced to underwrite the bingo games, the horse races, the large advertisements and the low-profit assortment of gimcracks, pills, powders paints and gadgets that clutter the shelves?

In this way a brake can be put on corporation agriculture by making it possible for family agriculture to maintain itself. I am sure that it is well within the province of this committee to deal with this question when they deal with the inroads and the dangers of corporate agriculture.

Lastly, let me say, that the United States needs an over all new land policy that orients on family agriculture as the means by which our food is produced. Congress should, using such a policy, enact the necessary legislation, whatever it takes, to implement this policy. There isn't much time left in which to do this. Much time has already been frittered away debating dimes and nickles, or band-aid remedies. But I don't think it is too late to reverse the onrush of corporate agriculture, provided action is taken soon. The only alternative, as I see it, to family agriculture is a sort of feudal system and all that goes with a feudal system of agriculture.

I wish to thank Senator Nelson and the rest of the committee for holding these hearings. I hope my report will help the committee in its deliberations and recommendations.

BEEF PROFITS

Safeway Hikes Price $188 on Each Carcass

(By Douglas Bradley)

Copyrighted 1967, Cervi's Rocky Mountain Journal

The chain supermarkets are making a gross profit of up to 45.49 percent on their sales of beef in the Denver Metropolitan area.

That means they are almost doubling their wholesale price when they sell the beef at retail to the Denver area housewife.

That is the astounding fact developed from a detailed study of cut-out and sold beef carcasses conducted by an independent panel that brought the results to this newspaper, asking not to be identified for fear of retaliation from the supermarkets.

On an average 600-pound steer carcass, the chains are making and have been making a little seen, little understood and seldom disclosed profit of up to $190.26 per carcass.

The supermarkets bought dressed carcasses in the last week of December and the first week of January, the period of the survey, for 37–38 cents a pound. That amounted to $228 per carcass delivered to the supermarket's butchering block.

That carcass and all similar, in turn, were sold to the public for $418.26, based on retail prices that prevailed over the recent two-weeks period in the three major supermarkets in the Denver area.