

see much merit in this—do you see any points of serious dissimilarity in what could be done to a fixed investment by a strike, in a pear orchard, at a crucial time where, if the picking is not done in a very short time the whole crop is gone, as opposed to a strike in the industry with which you deal primarily?

Would you see this giving rise to any restrictions on agriculture on the right to strike?

Mr. REUTHER. I would say that that is no greater a problem or no lesser a problem with respect to the harvesting of the crop than it is in the processing of that crop in the cannery.

Supposing the cannery workers decided to strike just at the peak of the salmon run? That would be just the same kind of problem.

How do you deal with that problem? As I suggested in my testimony, there are two ways of dealing with it. One is a rational way of giving these workers access to the collective bargaining process, so you can work out agreements before that kind of a crisis.

The other way is to turn your back on it and let them develop the tactics of guerrilla warfare.

There is no other way. Either by using the democratic tools of collective bargaining, or let it flow out of the bitterness of guerrilla warfare.

I say that the growers and the canners and everybody else involved in the management side of the problem are in a much more secure and protected position if it is worked out through collective bargaining.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Would you see any relaxation of prohibitions on the courts having the power to issue injunctions? Let's assume there were a strike at a critical time—hopefully there would be none—but assume there was one at a critical time.

In this field of agriculture, should the courts have the power to come out with very swift injunctions in order to stop irreparable damages?

Mr. REUTHER. When you are dealing with human problems, no one has the judgment to judge the equities of other people.

In that situation, action, in each situation, always with the knowledge that the total community has a greater equity, and that that transcends the equities of labor or management.

When that spirit breaks down completely, there are no simple answers to that question, and I don't care what court of law, or the Congress, or the Presidency, no one has any pat answers that will solve those kinds of problems.

What we need to do in a free society is to work to make the tools of democracy more adequate, and hopefully that men of good will—using those democratic tools—will find the means of resolving their own problems within a framework of a policy that serves the basic needs of our whole society.

You ask hypothetical questions in the automobile questions. Thirty years ago when we began to organize, there were a million hypothetical questions raised about what would happen in this situation on that and could the companies afford our demands?

What has happened? We have made great progress. An automobile worker's economic well-being today reflects tremendous progress over what it was 30 years ago, but the industry has also made great progress.