

workers were there. The organizing campaign and election occurred in the same manner as at a year-round plant—except that the election had to be held in a particular period of time.

Is the alleged uniqueness that agriculture deals with perishables? So does the entire food-processing industry.

In fact, the members of the committee will recall that during the minimum-wage battle of last year, vegetable and fruit canning and freezing was again permitted to work employees longer hours without paying premium overtime rates because the industry deals with perishable products.

But this industry has been covered by the NLRA since the inception of the act.

Is the uniqueness that agriculture contains some small operators? So does the food, service, and many other industries.

It is unlikely that the small farms might face NLRB elections. These farms use comparatively little hired labor and they are steadily being merged anyway.

The uniqueness story does not work. It is a pure alibi for the maintenance of an exemption which has no justification.

#### “HARVEST STRIKE” MYTH

Then there is the myth about the “strike at harvest season.” It goes something like this: A strike at harvest would kill the entire crop and absolutely ruin the grower. Therefore, NLRA coverage may doom the grower.

Frankly this is an argument I have difficulty following.

There is no denying that a harvesttime strike would hurt growers. But what has that got to do with NLRA coverage?

Harvesttime strikes are feasible and legal—NLRA coverage or no. In fact, at the moment, they are far more likely because of the lack of a rule of law in labor-management relations in agriculture.

The experience of labor and management in California farming in the last 2 years amply shows that workers often must strike in order to get to collective-bargaining-agent elections. If an established procedure to decide whether a union represents workers had been available, most of the strikes, boycotts, and other actions of industrial warfare would not have taken place.

The fact is that NLRA coverage is a means for limiting strikes and labor-management fighting. It sets up alternative procedures.

We do not mean to say that after NLRA coverage is enacted, there will no longer be strikes in agriculture. But we do say that another technique would be available to decide recognition and to determine unfair labor practices. And, therefore, labor-management relations in agriculture would be far more peaceful.

#### “UNION DOMINATION” MYTH

Then, there is the myth about “unions controlling agriculture with NLRA coverage.” A great many growers frankly believe this. They are unfamiliar with NLRA and the working of the National Labor Relations Board. They have constructed a bogeyman and have scared themselves with it.