

people at heart, would agree with me that farm workers find themselves by and large living under deplorable conditions and making a very low wage and really unable to support their families in decency.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly I agree we do and I am concerned with that, although as the gentleman has well pointed out, we all probably emphasize things where we feel we have the responsibility. We feel that by definition, our committee has primary responsibility for the farm, while your committee has primary responsibility for the labor, in the term "farm labor."

Mr. O'HARA. I would agree with the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, that the typical American farmer is not in such a good position either. I was hoping that perhaps we could find some way to resolve both of our difficulties and both of our problems.

We obviously don't want to bring collective bargaining into the intimate relationship between a small general farmer and his one or two hired men. That is not our purpose. We would deplore that, in fact, as much as the gentleman from Texas does. What we want to do is with respect to those farm employers that employ relatively large numbers of workers, even though over a relatively short season, is to give to those workers the same rights to engage in collective bargaining as their counterparts have elsewhere. We think that they can help themselves perhaps more than we could or should help them. I don't think the gentleman from Texas would disagree with the aims of this legislation with respect to those employers of rather large labor forces, would you?

Mr. POAGE. No, I see a close relationship between those with a large labor force and true industry as we have known it. Of course, oftentimes we get what has been, I think, aptly termed "factories in the field," and I recognize that when you reach that stage you have to use factory methods. We are not going to say that everything you are trying to do is wrong.

Mr. O'HARA. I'm happy to hear the gentleman say that. Even though on broad principles I have been opposed to writing jurisdictional standards into the National Labor Relations Act, I would like to see if we can find a way in this legislation to confine its impact as a matter of law to the situations in which relatively large numbers of people are employed on a farm. If we could give the chairman reasonable assurance that this bill was not simply a temporary expedient adopted to get the legislation through and that we did not later intend to come back and apply it to every farmer in America, would the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture be sympathetic with what we were trying to do and try to find a way to support the legislation?

Mr. POAGE. I would much rather find a way to be working with you folks than against you.

Mr. O'HARA. About this business of the "foot in the door," I'm sure that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture sympathizes with us, that the "foot in the door" argument is awfully hard to answer. I know it has been used against you repeatedly in connection with the programs you have brought before the House with respect to acreage controls and the pricing system, and so forth. But you have done a wonderful job of refuting it and I have gone along with you in that. I want to assure you that we are not trying to get any foot in any door.