

Mr. THOMPSON. And this is an act that your organization helped to pass.

Mr. TRIGGS. As being preferable to the Wagner Act; yes, sir.

Mr. FORD. All right.

At the time you endorsed this legislation, did you think it was good legislation, for the country, that it was a good national policy to have uniform regulations of dealings between labor and management so that we would, as many of the supporters of that act said, contribute to labor peace?

Mr. TRIGGS. I think, Mr. Ford, that we didn't go so far as to make any such assumption. All that our position was based on was that the Taft-Hartley Act was an improvement over the situation that existed then. That, of course, is the situation we commonly faced in all legislative matters.

Mr. FORD. Are you saying, then, that given the alternative between the Taft-Hartley Act and the Wagner Act, you would support the Taft-Hartley Act, but given the alternative between the Taft-Hartley Act and no labor legislation of this kind, you would prefer none?

Mr. TRIGGS. I don't know. We do believe that the Taft-Hartley Act should be amended in numerous respects.

Mr. FORD. But would you support its repeal?

Mr. TRIGGS. We supported the amendments of the Landrum-Griffin bill to the Taft-Hartley Act, but we have no position favoring repeal of the present legislation.

Mr. FORD. Let's put it this way: Do you feel it is to the best interests of this country to have a national policy governing the orderly methods of collective bargaining between labor and management, such as the Taft-Hartley Act provided for? Is that a good national policy?

Mr. TRIGGS. We believe it is desirable to have a strong labor movement in the United States—

Mr. FORD. I don't ask you for an opinion on whether organized labor is desirable. Is it desirable to have Federal law that makes uniform throughout the 50 States the regulation of the respective rights of labor and management, such as the Taft-Hartley Act?

Mr. TRIGGS. I don't believe we have anything in our policy that specifically deals with that question. Our policy deals only with those things that we would like to change. We accept the existence of the Taft-Hartley Act without specifically endorsing it or opposing it.

Mr. FORD. Do you think it is desirable that the people in the automobile industry, for example, are under the restraint of the Taft-Hartley Act not to engage in secondary boycotts?

Mr. TRIGGS. We believe in that prohibition as one desirable thing in the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. FORD. And would that be a desirable restriction on farmworkers, also?

Mr. TRIGGS. Certainly.

Mr. FORD. Would you feel other restraints against farmworkers, that the labor practices should be extended to the farmworkers as well?

Mr. TRIGGS. If there were an extension of the act to cover agriculture, we would favor that provision with respect to unfair labor practices; yes, sir. That is a big "if," you understand.