

But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to get to the question before us, the resolution adopted by the Agriculture Committee, and I want to start off by making a public apology which I have already made privately to the chairman. When I learned of the Agriculture Committee's action from the AP ticker on the afternoon of the day that it occurred I was understandably, I think, but nevertheless unforgiveably incensed and I made some rather intemperate comments about that action which I now regret I made. I would like to make that clear to those assembled here and have it published in the record. I have the highest regard for the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, as evidenced, I believe, by the support I have given the proposals he has brought before the Congress. I think he is an eminent leader of the farm economy. I wish to make that clear.

Mr. Chairman, on this question of jurisdiction though, I think it is entirely certain that the Committee on Education and Labor has jurisdiction, a very clear-cut jurisdiction over H.R. 4769. The bill before us, as its title indicates, is a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act.

Under the granted jurisdiction given the Committee on Education and Labor by the rules of the House, one of the areas of jurisdiction—in fact, the paramount area of jurisdiction of this committee—concerns amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

So there is not any real question or any technical question of jurisdiction, although I certainly understand the interest of the Committee on Agriculture, because we are dealing specifically with agricultural employees. But I can't recall any other instance in the something over 9 years that I have been a Member of Congress where there has been a question of dual jurisdiction, except in the case of a highway bill which involves both the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works and the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means because of the highway trust fund. I cannot recall any instance in the over 9 years where any committee has adopted such a resolution, formally adopted a resolution concerning a matter within the jurisdiction of another committee.

Now, the chairman has been a Member of Congress for, I guess, over 30 years and I wondered if he could recall for me any precedent for the action of his committee.

Mr. POAGE. I don't recall any precedent at all. There was none presented to our committee, but it was the feeling of our committee that we were raising no question of your jurisdiction. There has been no question raised of jurisdiction because I think you are exactly right, that this committee properly has jurisdiction, but I think, as I said in my statement a moment ago, that the very name, "agricultural labor," would indicate that both this committee and the Agriculture Committee has a deep interest in the subject matter and should take notice of it.

And if I understand the committee system at all, it is that a certain group of Members of the Congress will specialize and work particularly in one field and will hear all that they can in support of or protest against any proposals relating to their subject matter.

Now, members of the Agriculture Committee are not, because of their membership on that committee, precluded from having an interest in matters that come before other committees.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the chairman would—