Mr. TRIGGS. It will be passed along to the consumer. It will be hardly discernible in the total, but it will be passed on.

Mr. THOMPSON. What effect would increased wages, where they are an average of 7 to 8 percent of the cost of productivity in agriculture, what substantial effect do you envision that that would have on consumer prices?

Mr. TRIGGS. I think our statement does not make a big pitch for the impact on consumers. I do not think it will have any major impact on consumers. There will be some increase in prices, depending on the extent to which workers through unions authorized by this law might be able to write terms and conditions of employment.

Mr. O'HARA. Just one more question, and then I think I will be through.

If producers could effectively band together in a farm marketing association, the processor who buys from them, if he is going to stay in business, is going to have to bargain with that association. He won't be able to maintain production because there won't be enough people outside the association for him to buy from.

Ideally, I think that is the way you would envision it working.

For instance, in my own area, almost all of dairy farmers belong to the Michigan Milk Producers Association. The distributors have to bargain with them, and indeed they do.

As a practical matter they have to, and that is how they determine how much they pay for their milk.

By the same token, if the bean producers in my area who produce 90 percent of the pea beans in the United States were to band together effectively, Stokely-Van Camp, Heinz, and the rest of the people who buy large quantities of pea beans would have to bargain with the association.

So with respect to your objections, you don't really mind too much if processors have to bargain with processing associations, but you do object when growers have to bargain with workers associations.

You don't mind hiring halls or pre-season agreements when they involve braceros, but you do object when arrangements are made under the NLRB, or with a crew leader—with respect to the union shop, and the obligation of the workers to support the union, and abide by the arrangements the union makes with the employer when the majority want to do so.

Now you object to that, but you don't object to marketing orders that put farmers——

Mr. TRIGGS. You ask me a lot of questions.

Mr. O'HARA. I am not asking, I am summing up.

Mr. TRIGGS. A bargaining association is voluntary, no farmer is compelled to join it, no processor is compelled to deal with it.

Now it is theoretically possible, theoretically possible, that a sufficiently large percentage of growers would join the bargaining association that they would have almost a monopoly position as sellers.

That is theoretical, but it doesn't happen.

Thinking of the two strongest bargaining associations I know of, the California Canning Peach Association and the California Canning Pear Association, they don't have all the growers by a long ways, maybe 50 or 60 percent of them, and they don't have the ability to write the contract to determine the price.