Mr. O'HARA. The Department of Agriculture defines a family farm as one that uses less than $1\frac{1}{2}$ man-years of hired labor, which breaks out to 390 man-days, or approximately 100 man-days per quarter. That is the test the Department of Agriculture uses, for whatever that is worth.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, we had testimony from representatives of the National Labor Relations Board with regard to how they would go about establishing just the kind of definitions and exemptions that you are talking about. They pointed out that they couldn't sit down and write an arbitrary rule that would be successful in obtaining equity. It would have to be a process of study and experimentation, just as with other industries. I am very pleased that you agree with me that this definition is such that it does not lend itself to being drawn into this legislation as a basis for exception which would be rigid and not susceptible to change. I am pleased because I am one of the members of the committee who have been resisting efforts to write into this legislation a rigid exemption definition without a full explanation of the difference between the small farm and the big farm. For that matter, even a big farm in Michigan would be a pretty small farm in your State, Mr. Chairman. So we aren't even talking in the same terms. But we have found in the administration of the National Labor Relations Act that there is a similarity to the problems they have had to face with industry.

I have in my district plants belonging to the Ford Motor Co. which deal with their employees in terms of hundreds of thousands at one time, and I also have many plants that employ five or six or 10 very highly skilled people who manufacture a great many things without which the automobile industry could not function. We have had no real difficulty over the years in finding a way to accommodate both under the regulations.

A reading of the history of both the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act would indicate that there has always been the kind of fear expressed in the resolution from your committee, "Whereas, unlike industrial employers, farmers are uniquely susceptible to strikes, labor disputes, and work lapses because of the perishability of their crops."

This uniqueness argument was used, as a matter of fact, at the time of the passage of the Wagner Act to exclude the building trades, but by the time of the adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act labor troubles affecting this and other segments of the industry led supporters of that legislation, including the National Farm Bureau, to feel that the building trades ought to be brought under the act and that this was a desirable place to control the kind of problems that had arisen.

And this uniqueness theory with respect to building trades had to do with seasonability and that is what we are talking about with crops. In most of the States north of the Mason-Dixon line, there are anywhere from 2 to 4 months in the year when construction cannot go on. We have been able to meet this challenge and work with it.

But again, not with any kind of rigid statutory exemption process, but by giving the Board an opportunity to work.

Having reached that point on the question of the Board, I come back to your statement which reads, "We see very little, if any, present need for the injection of a third party into agricultural labor relations."

But then you go on to say, "But even so, we would be very reluctant