Statements and Letters From Opponents of H.R. 4769

New York Farm Bureau, Inc.,
Glenmont, N.Y., May 19, 1967.

Hon. Frank J. Horton,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Horton: Farm Bureau members are greatly concerned about what the impact might be if the National Labor Relations Act were extended to agriculture.

Agriculture is different from industry and the difference is even more pronounced in New York because our agricultural products are largely of a perishable nature. "Farm factories" cannot be closed down at will as can an industrial plant—crops keep on growing, hens keep on laying eggs and cows have to be milked at least twice a day.

Strikes are labor's greatest weapon. Farmers with crops ready to harvest and cows to milk are particularly vulnerable to strikes and if crops are not harvested and moved to market in the short period available, an entire year's loss of income is incurred. We believe enactment of this bill into law would accelerate mechanization of farm operations thereby tending to reduce farm employment which would first be felt by the less skilled workers, a group whose lot we are all trying to improve.

There are other features of this bill which would be detrimental to agriculture, force farmers out of business, decrease the supply of farm products and increase their cost to consumers.

We urge your opposition.

Yours sincerely,

C. K. Bullock,
Legislative Director.

International Apple Association, Inc.,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1967.

Hon. Frank Thompson, Jr.,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Labor, House Education and Labor Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Thompson: We are unalterably opposed to the enactment of H.R. 4769.

It was regrettable that the Subcommittee determined it was "impossible" to grant our request to present the views of our membership during the hearings which closed on May 12.

H.R. 4769 would extend the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act to include agriculture. It would require a farmer to recognize a Union as the bargaining agent for his workers and enter into a collective bargaining contract with the Union, enforceable by the National Labor Relations Board and the Federal Courts. The terms of the farmer employer-Union contract could:

1. Establish a Union hiring hall by requiring farmers to fill job openings from Union referrals;
2. Require Union membership as a condition of employment within seven days of employment;
3. Permit a Union, which has *not* been recognized by an election as representing a majority of the farmers' workers, to bargain with the farmer; and
4. Specify minimum experience qualifications and provide for seniority in employment to govern promotions.

Except for the construction industry (and agriculture, if this bill is enacted) a Union hiring hall is not specifically provided for in the N.L.R.A. Likewise, an employer is not required to bargain with a Union unless it has been established by a bona fide election that the Union represents a majority of his employees,