It would interfere with the necessary recruiting of agricultural labor and probably result in discriminatory practice by the union contrary to the provisions of Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act.

L. H. MOORE CANNING CO.,
McAllen, Tex., May 30, 1967.

Hon. KIKI DE LA GARZA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR KIKI: It appears to me that agricultural labor now having a floor under their wages starting with a $1.00 per hour as of the first of last February, is quite a forward step. This minimum wage is going to advance over the coming years which will bring their agricultural wages more in line with industry.

I feel that the agricultural community does need a little time to accomplish this change over, without the addition of the National Labor Relations Act being place on their shoulders at the same time. Why don't we give agriculture a little time to get in step before we add this improvement.

Thanking you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS H. MOORE.

NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1967.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Presently under consideration by your Subcommittee is a bill—H.R. 4769—which would amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture.

At the Federation's last annual meeting, its dairy farmer members adopted a resolution opposing elements such as unionization of farm laborers which would result in an increase in the cost of milk production unless these factors are accompanied by corresponding increases in prices to dairy farmers. Under present economic and industry conditions, it is unlikely that increased costs of production which would result from unionization of farm employees would be reflected in higher prices to dairy farmers.

During the past few years, unusually large numbers of dairy farmers have discontinued their farm operations. This has been due primarily to the inordinately low returns derived by dairy farmers compared with the capital investment required, the high cost of production, and the time-consuming and backbreaking labor required of the farm owner.

This exodus of dairy farmers resulted, early in 1966, in a reasonable balance between the supply of milk and dairy products and market requirements so that farm prices improved to some degree. However, as prices improved, increasingly large quantities of dairy products were imported so that the modest increases in prices which dairy farmers had been receiving receded. At the present time, almost unlimited quantities of dairy products are being imported. It would seem, therefore, the American dairy farmers are caught in a near hopeless vise of high domestic costs of production and low-priced foreign produced products. Under such circumstances, unionization of farm laborers which would almost certainly increase the cost of milk production without resulting in a corresponding increase in prices to producers would cause additional numbers of dairy farmers to go out of business and further diminish the domestic supply of milk and dairy products upon which American consumers have grown to reply.

One of the largest single elements of a dairy farmer's cost of production is the labor cost. Usually, laborers employed by American dairy farmers receive well above minimum wages. In addition to their salaries, many dairy farm employees are provided with housing and board. Since the cost of production is abnormally high under present conditions, unionization could only cause additional numbers of dairy farmers to go out of business.

Dairy farmers would be particularly vulnerable to a labor dispute since they are the producers of a highly perishable commodity. A labor dispute at the production level would be particularly harmful to the farmer. Such a dispute