

Congress in this session take further steps to right these ancient wrongs that we have been doing as a free nation to our agricultural workers.

The average wage in 1966, among agricultural workers, was \$1.07 per hour, and the average wage for manufacturing workers was \$2.75 an hour.

Of the 3 million agricultural workers, out of the 3 million, only 600,000, it is estimated, worked more than 150 days. So if you take their hourly rate and translate that into an annual income based upon the short period of their employment, you will understand the level of poverty in which they are engulfed.

Now, the wage increases that workers seek in the American economy are not made possible by an economic Santa Clause. Higher wages, improved benefits, greater security, all these things are possible out of our developing technology.

If you look at the automobile industry, where we have had a fantastic increase in labor productivity, because we have had the application there of the most advanced tools of science and technology, of automation, of the tools of the computer—in 1946 as compared to 1966, in 1966 7 percent more automobile workers turned out 116 percent more cars and trucks.

Now they were not the same cars and trucks. They were much more complicated, they had bigger engines, they had many accessories that did not exist in 1947, and yet the productivity increase in the field of agriculture has increased much more rapidly than has the increase in the manufacturing sector of the American economy.

Workers in the manufacturing section have shared in the greater equity of that increased productivity. They have not realized their full equity, and that is why we keep going back to the collective bargaining table, but in the agricultural sector of our economy, where the productivity has been greater, the workers there fall further and further behind and are denied a smaller and smaller share of the fruits of their labor.

In 1935, when the Wagner Act was enacted, when it became the law of the land that the right to self-organization, to the choice of a union and access to the processes of collective bargaining were built into the structure of the laws of this land, why weren't the agricultural workers included?

Was it a matter of philosophy? Was it a matter of economics, or a matter of justice? It was a matter of pure and simple political expediency.

The people who were managing that bill looked at the Congress and they said, "We are charting new ground in the field of labor-management relations, and if we include the agricultural workers, it may create some problems and, therefore, as a matter of expediency, we will exclude them."

And the chairman of that committee, Congressman Connery, said at the time that that legislation was being considered, these words, taken from the Congressional Record—and I quote:

We hope that the agricultural workers eventually will be taken care of. If we can get this bill through and get it working properly, there will be opportunity later, I hope soon, to take care of the agricultural workers.

It has been 32 years, and his hopes still have not been realized, and this is why we believe we need the greatest sense of urgency with respect to the legislation that you are currently considering.