Now one of the other arguments that are raised by these people who have a vested interest in the status quo, and who, without doubt, live quite well—it is amazing how a person who lives well is always willing to talk about the other person who lives badly.

We have seen this happen. This is the old double standard that we face at the bargaining table. These are the people who tell us, "If you make $800,000 a year, and if you are motivated by the thing called individual initiative, and you are trying to get $900,000 a year, that this somehow is economically sound, noninflationary and the highest expression of American patriotism."

But if you are an $8,000 worker, and you are trying to get $9,000, that is highly inflationary and downright subversive.

This is nonsense. It takes a kind of mental gymnastics to arrive at these cockeyed ideas.

These people who are trying to hold down the agricultural workers are living high on the hog.

They raise as a fourth point, "If you improve the lot of the agricultural worker, you are going to increase the cost of food," and this of course is supposed to mobilize the American housewife so that she is ready to march on Washington to see that you fellows don't raise the price of their grocery bills.

What are the facts?

The facts are that the index of the cost of living in 1966 went up 3 percent. Food went up 5 percent. But was it because agricultural workers made such tremendous progress in raising their wages and improving their economic conditions? The answer is "No."

Most of the increase in the cost of food was an act of God, and if you look at those items in the food basket where the real pressures were, you will find that the freeze on citrus fruits was a factor. On vegetables, in other areas of the country, the drought.

These are the things that had more of an impact on the price of food than the wage levels of agricultural workers, and the Department of Labor made a study of this in 1966, and it was published in February of 1967, and that report has the following to say, and I quote:

> Farm labor costs are such a small fraction of the retail price of most fruits and vegetables that it is doubtful that they contributed significantly to the rise in the cost of living.

They also, in the conjunction of the minimum wage bill to the very limited number of agricultural workers, had this to say in their study that was published in January of 1966, and I quote again:

> The greater wage bill increase required to adjust to a minimum wage in agriculture is offset to some extent by the fact that in agriculture wages constitute a smaller proportion of receipts than do wages in low-wage industries.
> In agriculture—

And this is the significant part of this report.

> In agriculture, cash wages of hired workers were 7 percent of cash receipts from marketing in recent years. Cash receipts do not include government payments.

If you include Government payments, it would be much less than 7 percent.