

Mr. FORD. You do not understand that if this legislation is adopted all those restraints against unfair labor practices would be extended to farm labor?

Mr. TRIGGS. Yes.

Mr. FORD. And there is not any restriction at this time?

Mr. TRIGGS. Well, there is with respect to secondary boycott.

Mr. FORD. With respect to farm labor?

Mr. TRIGGS. Yes.

Mr. FORD. Do you believe that to be the fact today?

Mr. TRIGGS. I believe this is so provided in the Taft-Hartley Act by the amendments of 1947.

Mr. FORD. To correct you, the record is replete with the definitions here, but as a matter of fact, there is no legal restraint against the farmworker in regard to this act.

If he belongs to a labor organization which has in its membership employees who would be covered by the act, then by the fact of his association with those covered employees, he becomes subject to the restraints of this act, but if he is not defined as an employee by that association in the act, he neither receives the benefits, nor is he subject to the restraints of this act.

Now, do you think that that is a healthy situation, looking down the road, that is liable to produce peace between labor and management in this great industry that you represent, the farmers of America?

Mr. TRIGGS. I think that if the act is going to be extended to farmworkers, that all of the prohibitions against unfair labor practices should be applicable to unions in agriculture, but we are not favoring the extension of the act for this reason.

Mr. FORD. In your prepared testimony, sir, you included the article, from your appendix B, the article from the Wall Street Journal of May 1, 1967.

What caught my attention is this was the fact that the article actually is talking about American capital, and American food-processing companies who are taking the American capital to a foreign country and producing a product not for the market of that country, or for export to other countries, but a product that they are going to import back into this country.

Do you think that is an undesirable use of American capital?

Mr. TRIGGS. Not necessarily at all, but we do point out that in the case of Mexico, as an example, that there is a growing amount of American capital in the processing industry in Mexico, and that that product is coming back to the United States in competition with our own products.

This is not all undesirable, but an expansion of this endeavor, which might be encouraged by what we would consider to be the threat of unionization, would be harmful to American farmers.

Mr. FORD. Reading from your prepared testimony here, we have companies like Libby, McNeil & Libby, S&W, DiGiorgio, Del Monte, listed as companies that are using American capital to construct plants in Mexico for the purpose of producing and processing food for sale in the United States.

Do you think that we ought to be considering any restraints on this kind of foreign investment?