Statistics indicate there exists a degree of economic concentration in parts of agriculture that matches any to be found in basic manufacturing. In view of this, the continuation of a farm policy that treats huge industrial farms as if they were small, frontier affairs of the 19th Century is nothing less than ludicrous. If it were not for the disgraceful effect on farm workers, one could almost laugh at the unreality which permeates the public sector's dealing with agriculture.

What are the farmer's objections to collective bargaining?

First, farmers object to collective bargaining because it would destroy the harmonious relationship between farmer and worker. We maintain and ask any grower to dispute the fact that this relationship is a thing of the past. Farm workers are hired by the hundreds and thousands at each corporate farm, preventing any possible relationship with their employer. Moreover, farm workers are sheltered in barracks and houses away from the "main house." Finally, personnel directors manage the workers today, not the farmer.

Second, farmers fear that strikes will "wipe them out" because of the perishable nature of their crops. We believe this fear is misfounded.

For almost twenty years, farm workers in Hawaii were protected by a little labor relations act which extended collective bargaining rights. Wages and fringe benefits have improved, while agriculture, especially sugarcane and pineapple, has prospered.

For over thirty years, our union has had favorable bargaining relations with producers of perishable products, such as meat, eggs, milk and cheese. For the last ten years, we have held contracts with packers and processors of farm commodities, such as melons, lettuce and tomatoes. During this time, a strike never ruined a grower, nor did unreasonable demands lead to a business closing. We invite any member of this committee to investigate our bargaining relationships in the packing sheds of California and Arizona. We ask that worried growers inquire too. For everyone will find the same thing, a mature and mutually acceptable bargaining relationship based on respect, not fear or economic coercion.

In this regard, the former governor of California has said: "There will be arguments presented against giving collective bargaining rights to field workers because such rights might endanger harvests but this is not persuasive. Packinghouse and shed workers have not disrupted harvest operations, although they are in a position to do so." [9] In point of fact, this same objection was raised to exclude shed workers from N.L.R.A. coverage.

Moreover, for the first time in many, many years there is bargaining between farmers and farm workers. Contracts between the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO and Schenley Industries and Di Giorgio Corporation demonstrate that it can be done.

So, the union can come to the farm, as it came to the food industry, in peace and cooperation.

Third, farmers often express concern that unions will eventually control their operations. We find this difficult to believe, because there is little evidence supporting such a conclusion. Organized workers in the industrialized sector do not control the companies which employ them. They have little to do with management on a day-to-day basis.

It would seem that the farm community has not heard of "management prerogatives." Management runs the business, whether it be on a farm or in a factory. Workers have no real interest or competence in that area. They are concerned with working conditions, wages and fringe benefits, not with production, sales and distribution.

Fourth, farmers believe that collective bargaining will push production costs upward and "squeeze" the farmer out of business because of his inability to pass higher costs on to consumers. Because of our parity policies, the farmer does not face a completely uncertain market. Rather, given the rising world demand for food-stuffs, the farmer faces an expanding market. Moreover, costs are passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices, which are reflected in an increasing consumer price index. Finally, the farmer withholds land from cultivation and even plows cultivated land in order to realize a better price, which reflects some degree of market control. So, the farmer is not the victim of uncertainty that he would have us think.

In summary, one student of the problem stated: "It must be observed, however, that the earlier efforts of agricultural interests to exempt the food proc-

[9] Quoted in Austin P. Morris, S.J., *Op. Cit.*, p. 1985