

I would like to observe in connection with Mr. Dellenback's observations that if the act were extended to agricultural workers it would not only carry positive benefits to the workers that have been covered so thoroughly by your testimony, but the very specific responsibilities in section 8, particularly, that go to both sides, particularly with respect to injunctions. A question of injunction in the case is always the specific matter that is before the court, but the injunction does become available in many instances where it is not now available.

It is conceivable that on the hit-and-run basis you could, one by one, either systematically or accidentally put a lot of people out of business.

But should we cover them by the act, the court would be available to prevent this sort of attack and maintain stability until such time as the collective-bargaining agreement was worked out.

The emergency strike provisions would certainly be in effect here. But isn't it true that at the time that you organized the automobile industry it was in a certain sense a seasonal employment business? As a boy growing up in Detroit, I remember that we counted on a long, long unpaid vacation every year in our family, and automobile workers did consider themselves to be really seasonal employees.

They, like schoolteachers, had to find another way to eat during that long, hot summer.

Mr. REUTHER. Your memory is very accurate. The automobile industry was notorious for the seasonal aspects of its employment. They brought hundreds of thousands of people from the South and worked them a few months, and then dumped them on the streets.

Some of them got on the welfare rolls and some of them went back home.

There was a tremendous fluctuation in the levels of employment. The union has made a tremendous change in that, and if you isolate one thing, and that is the SUB program, it is amazing. When the companies had to carry a larger burden of the unemployment cost, they stabilized their working schedule. As long as the workers had to carry the greater part of the cost, the companies did not have the incentive to do anything about it.

Mr. FORD. One other point raised by Mr. Dellenback was the possible problem with regard to the hypothesis of having a prehire arrangement where you take a person from one part of the country and in advance commit yourself to his hire without knowing whether the kind of crop he was picking would equip him with skills to handle the crop in your own State.

As a matter of fact, isn't it true that presently the same sort of thing is done with people who engage in the business of supplying farm labor in blocks of 30 people, 50 people, or whatever is demanded, and don't the growers now rely on some other person to pick people that will be qualified to do the work they are seeking the employees for?

Mr. REUTHER. A grower could not operate unless he was a very large grower and he has his whole recruitment mechanism himself, he could not work without the service of these contractors who really go out and recruit and sell the manpower to the growers.

Under a hiring hall arrangement, this could all be formalized as a mechanism between the workers through their union and the employer and the growers association. This thing would obviously work much smoother, and the grower would have greater assurance of having