for the kind of rough and tumble uncertainty and turmoil which now exists.

Would you not say, Mr. Meany, that would be the principal effect of this legislation?

Mr. MEANY. The history of the industrial strife and industrial problems bears that out because, as you know, before they passed the National Labor Relations Act there had been an exhaustive investigation by Congress and the LaFollette Civil Liberties Committee, and the record is dozens of volumes of sworn testimony and the testimony was about war. All of those records—and I have gone through them—is a story of a war.

Well, now we do have our problems and we do have strikes here and there and when we get to the time we don't have strikes, then I think we are really in trouble; not that I advocate strikes, no labor leader worthy of his salt wants to strike, but you have got to have that right.

As a result of the report of the LaFollette Civil Liberties Committee, Congress enacted the first Wagner Act and the purpose of it, as I said at the time, was to bring equality in the strength of employer and employee compelling recognition of unions and the right to collective bargaining and, of course, with certain obligations on the unions.

Now, the record of the 1920's, as I say, and the early 1930's was a record of war where great corporations in this country spent millions of dollars, hired agencies for no other purpose but to deny to their workers the right to get together and present their case as a group as to what their conditions of work and their hours and their wages should be. So, surely, the National Labor Relations Act, no matter what else anyone might say about it, they cannot say it did not bring some order out of what was chaos before and there is absolutely no reason to believe that this would not carry on the same way in the agricultural industry.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would the gentleman yield for an observation?

It is fascinating to know that the resistance to such legislation as Mr. O'Hara is proposing comes from many of the farmers themselves, the principals. They don't want the worker to have the right to bargain collectively and to cooperate with other workers. Yet the farmers use cooperatives for all sorts of purposes: for the marketing of their produce, for the purchasing of machinery, and for the purchase of their electricity. It is sort of a unilateral thing. They want to cooperate but they don't want their worker to have that same right.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my attention to Mr. Meany's comments about the hired man.

I agree with your analysis of the typical situation of the hired man being the reason that the farmer is not included in the first place, and I similarly agree that the situation has changed a good deal since the days of the Wagner Act. I do think the hired man under the circumstances you described still exists to an extent; that is, in effect, as part of the family, eating at the family table and so forth. I would not like to deny that still exists, but it is not at issue in this legislation.

Mr. MEANY. That family hired man would not be affected by this legislation at all.

Mr. O'HARA. Exactly. The argument about whether that still exists to any extent is not really at issue in this legislation.