down the road and he and his son run the farm and you could not saddle him with all these laws which would cause him to be compelled to do paperwork and all this sort of thing and it just was not necessary. Now, whether that was true or not at that time, I am not ready to say, but, as I pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that type of farm is gone.

I have seen some of these complexes out on the west coast and in the Southwest and also in your home State in southern New Jersey. I have seen some of these things and these are agricultural factories; they have no relation to the old farmer and his hired hand. They employ thousands of workers.

Mr. THOMPSON. They have a stability, too, in the sense that they are factories; they have an almost permanent work force.

Mr. MEANY. Yes. They don't have the same seasonal problem that the old farmer had.

Mr. THOMPSON. For the most part, the agricultural worker is not under the act because he moves, he is ineligible to register and vote in most areas, and he, therefore, cannot help himself. He has virtually no protection.

It is interesting to note, as I mentioned to you earlier, the decline in the number of dairy farmers in New Jersey. We have a great problem there now but this will reinforce your statistics or your statement that the farmowner is not threatened by higher wages and working conditions. In 1958 our dairy farmers were getting $5.38 a hundredweight for their milk. In 1966, they are getting $5.41, an increase of only 3 cents. In the meantime, the cost of their hay went from $3.83 a hundred pounds to $4.61, and for alfalfa hay from $41.50 a ton to $49; all of this with just a 3-cent increase.

Interestingly enough, and this does reinforce your statement, the hourly rates paid by farmers in 1960 on dairy farms was $1.16 an hour. In 1966 it is $1.39 an hour—that little increase which is minuscule in comparison with the rise in fringe benefits and increases by industrial workers, thanks to the fact that they are organized.

Mr. O'Hara, would you like to comment?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reiterate your statement about Mr. Meany's presentation. As a matter of fact, I am a little bit hesitant to expand upon Mr. Meany's statement because I think that he has said the things that need to be said in a better way than I could.

Mr. Meany has very forcefully stated the reasons for the introduction of this legislation. If I were to suggest any one thing as the principal effect of this legislation, if it should be adopted, it would be to regularize the methods by which farm organizations are recognized.

In other words, I think the outstanding characteristics of this legislation would be to end a lot of uncertainty and turmoil with respect to farm labor and conditions of their employment.

After all, was that not really the principal reason for the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act? That is, to provide some system imposing restraints upon the employer and upon the employee organization with respect to their methods of gaining recognition or giving recognition and the terms and conditions under which they bargained and worked out their agreements?

We provided a regular method of doing so and we substituted that for turmoil. I think that would be the effect of this legislation on the farmer. We would substitute order and a definite way of doing things