Labor Relations Act, I am confident we would not be here to oppose the bill, but 4769 does far more than that.

This is a miniscule part of the bill. It establishes the principle—it

authorizes compulsory union and checkoffs-

Mr. Thompson. In what way?

Mr. Triggs. Because the National Labor Relations Act authorizes

Mr. Thompson. Compulsory unionism?

Mr. Triggs. Yes.

Mr. Thompson. That is not so, that is absolutely not so. This is an oblique return to the 14(b) question.

Mr. Triggs. Which I am glad to note is now dormant.

I haven't quite finished, though.

The bill before the committee includes authorization for I won't say "compulsory" but union shop.

Mr. Thompson. There is a difference, isn't there? Mr. Triggs. And a requirement for checkoffs-

Mr. Thompson. If, as a matter of contract, checkoffs are agreed

upon? Mr. Triggs. And requires it applies to collective bargaining with a union, it includes hiring halls and preemployment contracts, and these are the parts of this bill that we are opposed to.

We are not opposed to the right of people to join an organization

and protect their interests.

Mr. Thompson. What you are really saying is that you are opposed to the sections of the National Labor Relations Act which allow as a matter of national policy the organization of workers into unions.

Mr. Triggs. No, we are not opposing those features. We are not opposing the extension of those features to agriculture.

Mr. THOMPSON. You don't mind it at all as long as you are not required to bargain with them. They can join a union, and you are perfectly happy so long as you don't have to bargain with them?

Mr. Trages. Most farmers in the country do bargain with their work-

ers, will talk to a committee of workers representing the whole group, but that is quite a different proposition in our view as compared with the proposition of forcing them to deal with the union.

Mr. Thompson. I would credit most farmers with being willing to

talk to their workers.

But some wouldn't in California. They wouldn't even talk to the clergy, but they, no doubt, represented a small group.

My questions are not based on any personal hostility. Mr. Tricgs. I appreciate that.

Mr. Thompson. Just from a deep conviction that you are as wrong

as you think I am.

Now, Mr. Scherle, from Iowa, is here. He is not a member of the subcommittee, but he is a member of the full committee, and I would like to give him an opportunity to ask you questions.

Mr. Triggs. Let me comment, that I appreciate the gentlemanly

Mr. THOMPSON. I once had an agreement with the Farm Bureau. The agreement I had was with respect to the migration of the redwinged blackbird up the east coast. I have a very glowing letter from