

The Association feels that what it presented to the Congress in reference to this subject in April, 1965 is still germane today and bears repeating verbatim at this time:

"Unions are an established fact of life on the American scene. They serve a needed and useful function in large industrial establishments. Their value is unquestioned. There is serious doubt, however, that the unrestricted power given the union is in the best interest of growers, unions or workers.

"Farm operations often are large and employees numerous. The desire of employees to improve their conditions is only natural. The overriding question is the question of strike at harvest. Crops mature as nature develops them. We can observe and flex with the development but we cannot control it. No group should have the life or death power to rule or ruin given in this bill to the unions.

"The growers' entire stake is in the crop at harvest time. For most crops this is a relatively fleeting moment of time if the crops are to be harvested at optimum quality and produce the maximum return. Nobody is able to 'negotiate' at this time. It can be only blackmail when coupled with the threat of crop loss. No subject can be considered on its merits under such conditions.

"Provisions in the bill force the worker to join the union whether he wishes to or not. The grower must bargain with the union regardless of the size of the union group. A dissident minority, under current Employment Service rules as few as two, could declare a 'labor dispute' and cut the employer off from U.S. Employment Service referrals.

"There are unions operating on farms. They have not been conspicuously successful nor have the unions been able to fill the full labor needs of the employer. Whether unions are needed or not has no bearing on this subject.

"We feel that agricultural employers should have the same rights and privileges as an industrial employer, particularly the right of dealing with established majorities of his workers. The dissatisfied and the malcontents are present in every group. To give them the power of stopping a harvest operation is to cater to anarchy. Likewise, the employees should have the privilege of freedom of choice to join or not to join. Much agricultural employment is of short term duration; the worker may feel that the length of employment is too short to justify paying union fees. This should be his prerogative."

VIRGINIA EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION INTEROFFICE COMMUNICATION

To: Manager—Winchester. Attention: Mr. David C. Nellis, Farm Placement Supervisor.

From: State Farm Placement Supervisor.

Subject: Telegram Received From Regional Office Pertaining to Wages.

Please inform Frederick County Fruit Growers Association and other interested growers of details contained in following telegram received today from Mr. John Francis Foy, Regional Administrator:

"Bureau and Florida agency representatives on Florida Pooled Interviews Itinerary report uncommitted fruit crews being exposed first to Virginia and West Virginia apple orders but are rejected employment commitments these orders in favor of more attractive piece rates to workers and higher override to crew leaders being offered in apple orders from other states. Reported also that two or more crew leaders who previously have brought workers to employers in Winchester and Martinsburg area should be informed that available supply of workers for apple picking has increasingly tightened. Many employers from other states, notably North Carolina, have increased their piece rate and override offers in effort to offset strong competition. There are growing doubts that worker supply states will be able to recruit successfully for Winchester growers in coming months in face of more attractive offers from competing employers. Since employers who desire to maintain eligibility to request foreign workers will be required to provide round trip transportation for workers who complete the season, negotiations are now underway with Puerto Rico Department of Labor to make workers available on short term contracts with these employers. The earnings guarantee required by Puerto Rico matches the \$1.35 adverse effect guarantee applicable to Virginia. Acceptance of these orders by Puerto Rico may ease the Winchester domestic worker shortage."