

collective bargaining can not arrive at an agreement, and I admit compulsory arbitration is no happy solution either. It is just by far the lesser of two evils. What do you think are the possibilities of such a solution?

Sincerely yours,

MID-SOUTH MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Memphis, Tenn., June 28, 1967.

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. THOMPSON, JR.: The Mid-South Milk Producers Association is a co-operative milk marketing association representing 600 Grade A Milk Producers. We have members in south west Kentucky, west Tennessee and northern Mississippi and we are interested in the welfare of our producers.

We understand that you are a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor and that your Committee is now giving consideration to H.R. 4769.

If this bill were permitted to be passed by Congress it would permit farmers to make collective bargaining agreements with a Union representing farm laborers without requiring the Union to show that it represents a majority of the employees. In the event a Union did represent a majority of farm laborers it would be an unfair practice for the farm owners to refuse to bargain in good faith with the Union. The collective bargaining agreements could require, as a condition of employment, that all employees join the designated labor organization.

If this bill were passed by Congress it could increase the cost of milk production unless there were corresponding increases in prices to producers. In view of the present economic outlook for dairy farmers coupled with the tremendous influx of dairy imports it is unlikely that there would be a corresponding increase in producers prices.

Great numbers of dairy farmers have already gone out of business because of the bleak dairy farmer income picture. Dairy farmers would be particularly vulnerable to a labor dispute, their already too low income could be further reduced. It is necessary to milk dairy cows twice daily and of course the milk is highly perishable, a labor dispute at the production level would be particularly harmful. Injecting labor disputes and strikes into the production of milk would be harmful to the stable and dependable domestic supply of milk and dairy products which dairy farmers have been able to supply to the American Consumer.

We sincerely hope that H.R. 4769 would not be voted out of your Committee.

Very truly yours,

ROSS B. CLARK, SECRETARY-MANAGER.

NATIONAL APPLE INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1967.

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
*House of Representatives,
 Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. THOMPSON: In behalf of all apple growers, and of agriculture in total, we strongly urge that agricultural workers should not be included in the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, as proposed in H.R. 4769.

At a time when strikes are becoming increasingly crippling to many industries and no satisfactory guidelines of responsible control have been achieved, providing a similar potential in agriculture would be disastrous.

While non-farming businesses suffer substantial losses in delays of product manufacture, delays in building completion, unwarranted infliction of inconvenience and punishment and financial loss to innocent people too involved in any way in the issues of labor controversies, and similar losses and tragedies, the potentials for similar bargaining tactics in agricultural production could prove completely disastrous to many agricultural businesses and would exact a high price indeed from the public at large. A strike called at apple harvest time, for example, really leaves no bargaining alternatives at all. The apple producer would have to acquiesce to any and all demands in a few short days, or stand to lose his entire apple crop and a full year's investment and work and ultimately his farm operation. Cows have to be milked regularly. Fruits and vegetables have to be harvested when ready, etc. Delays and tie-ups in these areas