

bill, no matter what exemptions you might put in it is dangerous, and I don't understand you have any exemptions in it at the present time, isn't that true?

Mr. THOMPSON. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. I don't understand that you are exempting any of these small farms. I understand that under the terms of the bill as it is now written that it applies to the man who employs one man for 1 week during the year just as well as it applies to the largest farm in California. But we fear that no matter—

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, might I interrupt you to explain that we don't normally apply exemptions in any bill. These are handled by the executive branch. They would undoubtedly do that in this case.

Do you know of any other piece of legislation that established collective bargaining or minimum wages and hours, which this does not, where experience justified your fears that somebody's brother-in-law might be hired on a temporary basis and they might be covered?

Where did this happen in the vast coverage of such legislation?

Mr. THOMPSON. If the gentleman will yield, the history of the jurisdictional amounts ought to be reassuring to Chairman Poage and the members of his committee. They have not changed in many, many years. Retail enterprises are \$500,000 gross volume of business; office buildings, gross revenue of \$100,000; public utilities, \$250,000 gross volume; transit systems, \$250,000; radio, television, telegraph, telephone, \$100,000 gross; newspaper enterprises, \$200,000; private hospitals, \$250,000; private nursing homes, \$100,000.

It is absolutely inconceivable that the Board would assume jurisdiction over the small family farm with an income of approximately \$6,000 or so a year. However, if this legislation is reported, we will take great care in the report to reassure the small family farmer.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I must respectfully suggest that I accept your statement that it "is absolutely inconceivable" to you, but it is very conceivable to some of the rest of us and is a very real danger in the opinion of some of the rest of us.

Now, we have a perfect right to have differences of opinion, but when we are told that it is "inconceivable." It is conceivable to us and we do conceive it, and we do fear it, and that is what we tried to express to your committee is that we do have this fear.

You say that our fear is unfounded and maybe it is, and it is perfectly proper for you to tell us our fears are unfounded, but to tell us we don't have any such fear—we do.

Mr. SCHEUER. May I just read one sentence from the hearings on this bill, page 184 of hearings on H.R. 4769. We are talking about the income of California agriculture, one sentence:

As the gross continues to soar to record heights, the net income for the farm is also rising, since the number of farms continue to drop as it has over the past decade. The net income, which is the amount the growers realize after deducting cost of production, taxes and other operating costs, was actually up 14 percent in 1966 over the 1960 to '64 period.

Now, that indicates that actually the plight of the small, marginal, if not submarginal, family farm in the city actually enhanced the economic soundness and the profitability of the remaining large industrial farms in California.