of the National Labor Relations Act. The farmer must have labor to harvest his crop when it is ready, or in the alternative lose his entire year's investment. The prospect is frightening. Nowhere in industry is an employer required to assume such a vulnerable bargaining position. The result of the enactment of H.R. 4769 would be to subject the grower to an injustice not inflicted on any other type of employer.

The practical effect of the passage of H.R. 4769 surely would be to accelerate the already established trend to move agricultural production outside of the United States, and consequently to expand even more rapidly the imports of fresh fruits and vegetables from foreign countries into the United States. Records of the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the past decade document the trend. At stake is a further deteroriation in the balance-of-trade situation, as well as the health of U.S. agriculture.

In still another respect, the special requirements of agriculture are such that it would be almost impossible to apply the administrative procedures necessary under the National Labor Relations Act. Such things as the almost overnight changes required in the size of a farmer-employer's work force at harvest time and again during the growing season, the migrant nature of the agricultural labor force inherent in the seasonal nature of fruit and vegetable production, and so on.

At their 63rd Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C., February 1, 1967, the members of this Association adopted the following resolution:

"It is again apparent that the Congress will be asked to consider and enact legislation dealing with the agricultural labor force of the United States. Among the legislation confronting the Congress and the nation are bills which would subject agricultural labor to the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act or its equivalent, and proposals for the recruitment, training, placement, and transportation of migrant farm labor by or under the auspices of the Secretary of Labor.

"We reaffirm our opposition to these proposals, for we believe they are not in the true national and industry interest."

In conclusion, we submit that H.R. 4769 does not recognize the essentially different nature and special requirements of agriculture which would make the application of the National Labor Relations Act to agriculture unjust, impractical, and not in the best interests of the citizens of the United States.

WAYNE COUNTY GROWERS & PROCESSORS, INC.,
Marion, N.Y., May 19, 1967.

Hon. FRANK HORTON,
Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: We held our Annual Meeting yesterday and much discussion took place and serious concern is felt should the following bill be passed.

The Proposed Bill HR–4769 and the corresponding bill S–8 would end exemptions of Agriculture under the National Labor Relations Act.

We are opposed to a regulation that compels employment only of workers who must join a union as a condition of employment and which jeopardizes the growers very existence through the instrument of a strike at harvest time. A field or vegetable crop will not change its maturing habits to satisfy the pressures of a labor union or the deliberations of the National Labor Relations Board. Just one act by the Union not only could destroy the entire crop but the farmer as well.

Therefore, Be It Resolved that we are opposed to any regulation that compels employment of workers who must join a union as a condition of employment.

Be it further Resolved that we contact our Legislative Representatives and express our opposition to this Bill. This was unanimously passed and inserted in our minutes.

Please give this serious consideration and we hope your vote will be along the lines we are thinking.

Very truly yours,

MARION I. JOHNSON, *President.*