These were workers who had not been organized and who are of various different ethnic groups. They were the poorest of poor. There is quite a difference in the power that they had or have and the power that corporate agriculture can use.

Furthermore, what happens in these disputes is that they are not over whether workers will get another 10 cents an hour or something else which sooner or later can be compromised and settled. These strikes are over whether there will be a union, whether these workers will have any collective bargaining relationships. These are issues which have to be settled one way or the other. Either there will be a union or there will not. You can't compromise.

Mr. GARDNER. Going on in the testimony, page 4, you say: "Either the law of the jungle will continue and the costs will be great, or established national laws will set the limits for both sides * * *" I would like to ask you—I am not entirely familiar with your particular union, but it would seem to me over the past few years we have not seen limits set for both sides. The President has set up certain guidelines for the unions and they seemed to totally disregard these guidelines, when on the other hand management has been forced to pretty well adhere to it. Why do you come up and say you think limits will be set for both sides?

Mr. MAYER. In the first place, the National Labor Relations Act does not cover prices and wage increases, which is what you are talking about, if you mention "guidelines."

Mr. GARDNER. Right.

Mr. MAYER. No. 2, I would very much disagree with you that labor does not adhere to the guidelines and management adheres to them. I think that is quite untrue as shown by the various steel price increases that have come on, quote, "selected," end of quote, items in recent months.

The guidelines concern wages and they were advisory. There are no laws involving wages or prices. Congress, except during World War II, has not acted on wages and prices. Congress has acted on the National Labor-Management Relations Act, which does prohibit acts by both labor and management.

Let me give you an example. In the old days, in 1935 to about 1947, if our union had been as well organized then as we are today, we could have organized most of the farms in the United States simply by telling our members not to handle the products of those companies which refused to sign labor-management contracts.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, which was enacted in 1947, we cannot do that. That is illegal. We can be brought into court, we can be sued for triple damages. We would face all sorts of criminal penalties as well as monetary penalties. This is one example.

Furthermore, under the NLRA, management has to bargain with the union which is certified by the NLRB as the bargaining agent. On the other hand, if a union goes into an election and loses that election, then that union cannot seek certification for bargaining with that management for at least a year. So you see there are rules and regulations, and they do apply to both sides.

Now, you and I may disagree whether they are too binding on labor or on management, but the rules and laws are there, they are on the books.