

I do not know of anyone, and I have talked to representatives of organized labor, who take a very practical view, and they say:

"Look, can you imagine for a minute that we have got the time or the resources to go out and try to organize small farmers that only employ one or two or three people? We don't even bother with manufacturing that has such a small work force.

"We make no effort to organize these very small work forces in manufacturing. And certainly we are not going to do it in agriculture. The problems of doing it in agriculture are even greater than they would be in manufacturing."

I think as a practical matter I know of no one who is really talking about organizing these workers. They just don't consider it to be appropriate or a fruitful exercise.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. O'Hara, I think that it is entirely conceivable that we can work something out to reassure our colleagues who are rightfully concerned about the small farmer. The hundreds of dairy farmers in my district would be unhappy if they thought I were trying to organize them, and I have to reassure them as well—it is even more important that I reassure them than it is I reassure my colleagues from other States, because I don't run against them or they can't vote for me.

In the case of your committee, I am glad that they can't. [Laughter.]

I would like to thank you very much for your time, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. O'HARA. Could I just ask one more question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. In regard to the jurisdictional standard, who would be covered, who would not, we have considered different alternatives. The one used by the NLRB has to do with dollar volume and I have pretty much come to the conclusion that is not very appropriate.

For instance, someone who has a cattle business might have a tremendous dollar volume, phenomenal dollar volume, because he buys cattle at a very considerable price, hangs onto them perhaps six weeks or eight weeks, and then sells again. His dollar volume might be tremendous. But he might employ very few men.

But other farmers might find themselves in a very different situation, so I have decided that a dollar volume test is probably not the best kind of test to use and I would like your comment on that.

Mr. POAGE. I would agree with the gentleman, the dollar volume is probably not the better test. Rather, I would agree with Chairman Thompson that probably the better test is something on the order of what we have in the minimum wage law at the present time, where the applicability is based upon the number of hours that are worked by individuals who are employed on the farm.

It seems to me that that gets to the question of whether they are a real factor in the labor market or not, whereas the dollar volume doesn't necessarily measure that at all.

Mr. O'HARA. I appreciate that comment and I want to state to you right now that I am going to work toward finding and getting into this bill an appropriate test of coverage based upon the amount of hired labor employed by the agricultural unit and if we could do that, I would hope that we could get the gentleman's support for legislation.

Mr. POAGE. I hope we can get together.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you very much again, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POAGE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and let me thank the committee. I appreciate your kindness.

Mr. THOMPSON. The committee is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:45 a.m. the subcommittee adjourned.)