

Mr. FORD. Your farmers enter into that agreement with a broker, and he goes to Puerto Rico and recruits the labor through his organization there, and delivers people subject to a contract that they have no part in drawing up, and a contract that in fact was made long before the season starts.

Is this not true?

Mr. TRIGGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORD. Isn't that a preseason contract?

Mr. TRIGGS. Yes; it is.

Mr. FORD. It is not objectionable to you?

Mr. TRIGGS. I think it is warranted in that case, because these folks come from a far distance.

Mr. FORD. When you do it as a preseason contract, regardless of who the parties are or who was consulted about its contents, how does that kind of a preseason contract, in principle, fail to place the farmer at the same disadvantage that you indicated you thought he would be in if a labor union was involved?

Mr. TRIGGS. I think we would be concerned about the preseason contract if it were negotiated with a labor union representing the workers in Puerto Rico.

Mr. FORD. Then it isn't the fact that the contract is entered into before the season starts that bothers you, it would only be that the contract is entered into before the season starts and a labor union represented the employees in arriving at that contract?

Mr. TRIGGS. We are concerned with the unionization of farmworkers, yes.

Mr. FORD. Then when you offer preseason contracts as an objection to this legislation you don't really mean all preseason contracts are objectionable, only preseason contracts where labor organizations would be a party to the contract?

Mr. TRIGGS. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. I am not trying to be personal in this, but were you with the Farm Bureau when the Taft-Hartley Act was adopted?

Mr. TRIGGS. I was with the California Farm Bureau at that time.

Mr. FORD. Do you know what the position of your national organization was on the adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act?

Mr. TRIGGS. Well, in general, and that was a long time ago—

Mr. FORD. If I may refresh your recollection, you were very strong supporters of it.

Mr. TRIGGS. Yes.

Mr. FORD. Do you think the position of your organization has changed? Would you still say that your organization thinks the Taft-Hartley Act was a good law?

Mr. TRIGGS. Yes; because it was an improvement over the Wagner Act. That doesn't mean we endorse everything that was in the Taft-Hartley Act. We are strong supporters of the concept that workers should have a free choice to join or not to join a union.

Mr. FORD. I am sure that you know the Taft-Hartley Act was a complete repeal and rewriting of the Wagner Act, and that the NLRA which we have been talking about all during these hearings is the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. TRIGGS. Yes.