

The question is: Why is it sought to shortcut this procedure and make it possible for a Union of agricultural workers to be recognized by the employer without following the rules which are applicable to other groups?

Further, I see no reason why the law should provide for exceptions to particular types of labor organizations because, under the proposed bill, you may enter into a contract even though the majority status of such labor organizations has not been established.

Under the amendment of Section 9 of the proposed bill, you may provide for an agreement which requires conditions of employment, membership in the labor organization after the seventh day following the beginning of employment, or the effective date of the agreement, whichever is later, and requires the employer to notify the labor organization of the opportunities for employment with such employer, or give such labor organization an opportunity to refer qualified applicants for such employment, and the agreement may specify minimum training or experience qualifications for employment or provide for priority and opportunities for employment based on length of service with such employer in the industry in the particular geographical areas.

It would appear to me that this legislation is designed to force agricultural laborers into a Union organization without requiring the Union to meet certain specifications presently provided for by the law, the reason undoubtedly being that it is difficult, plus the cost involved in organizing groups that may not be concentrated in a particular area, thus imposing upon the employer conditions which may not prevail in his area, but which may prevail in other areas.

As an example: In an area in which there is concentrated industrial opportunity, conditions for agricultural labor may be entirely different than in an area which is primarily agricultural.

This type of legislation is not good because it gives certain types of industry, and those who work therein, advantages over other industries and under such circumstances, there is always a possibility for abuse of the individuals who may be involved in the particular industry.

Personally, I cannot see this approach to the subject, since this bill is discriminatory in favor of two particular groups, namely: the construction industry and the agricultural industry in the unionization of its workers.

This bill extends to agriculture the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, as applicable to the construction industry. It requires 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.

The union would have such a monopoly over labor and such power to destroy the farmer, that from a practical standpoint the union would in effect be setting hourly wages for the whole of agriculture.

A farmer could be made to bargain with the union even though none of his employees desired to join a union. The union could make a demand upon the farmer to bargain, state the wage it demanded, threaten the farmer with a strike unless he signed the contract. Provisions in the bill force the worker to join the union whether he wishes to or not.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that the persistent efforts to secure the passage of such legislation as H.R. 4769, must be construed as an indication that the union bosses will not take "no" for an answer.

No one from a non-labor sector of private life—except do-gooders and well-intentioned but misguided busybodies, has ever appeared before this subcommittee to endorse this legislation. These people are not farmers, in all probability they have had no experience in agriculture, they do not understand agriculture in all its ramifications.

Do they know that only 6.5 percent of our people are engaged in agriculture? Do they know that American agricultural production is the envy of the world, and that the American people are the best fed people in the world?