determining their rights to collective bargaining. I would like to ask the chairman with respect to each of the major provisions that would be applied to agriculture by this bill whether or not he disagrees or agrees with the methods adopted by the bill.

Mr. POAGE. May I suggest that I am not saying that I disagree with any particular provision. I am suggesting that we disagree, first, with the necessity of the legislation; second, with what we feel is the almost certainty that it will ultimately come down to a point where the man who simply employs his brother-in-law to help him a few days will be brought under the terms of the law and we think that that is a great mistake.

I believe that the author himself has proposed an amendment to the bill to limit it to farms which produce $50,000 of production. Isn't that right? I may be wrongly informed.

Mr. O'HARA. That is in essence correct. I have suggested that that is probably the test, the jurisdictional test that would be applied by the National Labor Relations Board. While I don't favor writing jurisdictional tests into the law itself, I have indicated informally to members of the committee that if that would reassure them, I would be willing to see it done. But that is the jurisdictional standard that the National Labor Relations Board now applies to nonretail industries, and I think it quite evidently would be the probable standard for agriculture.

But, Mr. Chairman, you see all we are doing here, we are not affecting the right of agricultural employees to strike. They have that right already, as has been evidenced by the farm strikes that we witnessed in recent years. Indeed farm strikes have been a part of American agriculture for a hundred years, starting, I think, with a strike by cowboys in Texas a great many years ago.

At any rate, what we are saying is that there should be a better way of deciding the question of whether the workers want a union; not by the trial of strength in which the union puts up a picket line, goes out on strike and tries to force the farm employer to sign an an agreement by making life difficult for him. This is not a good method of settling a dispute.

We think that when a union attempts to organize farmworkers, there should be some way of determining whether those farmworkers want to belong to the union.

Now, I don't think the gentleman from Texas would quarrel with that method of doing business.

Mr. POAGE. We are not offering any quarrel.

Mr. O'HARA. Basically what we are saying is that when a question of representation is raised with respect to a farm employer, when the employees, on a showing by the union of sufficient interest with 30 percent of the members of workers having signed cards, or when the employer doubts that a majority of the members want to join a union, either employees or employer can say to the NLRB, "We want a secret ballot election to determine whether or not these workers really want to belong to that union."

That is in effect the prime purpose of the bill, to have that issue decided not by strike, not by a trial of strength, but by a secret ballot vote, and at the request of either the union or of the farm employer. And I think the gentleman would agree with that approach at least, that it is a better way of doing business than the way it has been going. Wouldn't you?