ers, in particular—from full access to schools, medical facilities, and other community resources they so badly need.

But the bill before you, we think, is the most important of all.

It offers no subsidies to farmworkers. It carries with it no appropriations. It is not special legislation; on the contrary, it is a bill to do away with special legislation.

It offers one simple proposition: That farmworkers have the same right as all other workers to organize and bargain collectively.

Surely, there is nothing revolutionary about this. But anyone who listened seriously to some of those who have consistently opposed this concept would imagine that the revolutionaries were at the gates.

One of the more restrained objections that has been raised, over the years, to extending the National Labor Relations Act to agriculture is that its administration would be impossible. Farmworkers move around too much, according to this argument. They work irregular periods of time for many different employers.

But as H.R. 4769 and its companion bills demonstrate, there is an easy and established solution to this problem—the same solution that works so well in the construction industry, where the work schedules are in the same pattern. So this objection is not valid at all.

Then there is another, even less rational argument, that goes something like this:

"We couldn't stand a strike at harvest time."

Well, it has been argued in the past that a steel mill can't stand a strike when it's time to pull the furnaces, and a construction job can't stand a strike when there's only 2 weeks before the first snow, and the auto industry can't stand a strike during the model changeover. But all those industries are organized, and all of them have had strikes, and all of them are doing all right. They and many others are paying far better wages and making much more money than the average farm employer.

Beyond this, I resent the implication that trade union organization and strikes go hand in hand. It simply is not so.

Yes, there will be strikes if an employer resists to the bitter end any and all of the proposals offered by the union. But an employer who does this is not basically against the proposals; he is against the union. In reality, he is the one who is on strike.

The same has been true of the farmworkers' strikes during the last year, only more so. Primarily, these have been strikes, not over wages and working conditions, but for the fundamental right to bargain collectively.

No worker in interstate commerce has had to strike for that right since 1935, for the right to organize has been established by law and has been enforceable by law. Simple justice, we contend, would extend that right to farmworkers as well.

Indeed, the prevention of such fruitless and disruptive strikes was a major purpose of the original National Labor Relations Act. The act established a procedure through which workers could make their own decision, legally and peacefully. Only a month or so ago, I joined—with representatives of the National Association of Manufacturers—in celebrating the 25 millionth vote in a representation election. Not a single one of these 25 million votes was cast by a farmworker to establish bargaining rights with the farm employer, because farmworkers are denied this basic, democratic right.