

Mr. POAGE. I would agree that that's a beautiful theory, but I would suggest that from my own observation, and I am not trying to suggest what the observations of you gentlemen who have helped with more of this in the industrial field than I have, but my own observation has been that it doesn't work in practice as it is proposed in theory, and we have not seen in either the industrial or the agricultural field the actual working of the real good theory that the gentleman is suggesting.

Now, I don't want to criticize anybody for trying to get perfection. I hope we can get perfection, but I don't expect to get it in my lifetime and yours.

Mr. THOMPSON. You know, Mr. Chairman, this collective bargaining process has existed in Hawaii for a great many years with tremendous success. The growers in California who have union contracts are highly enthusiastic about the idea. It also works in Puerto Rico, and we think it would work in the United States.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the hour is growing late and other members are here obviously seeking an opportunity to ask questions. I would like to yield, but before I do, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that if there is time remaining upon the conclusion of other members, then I would like at that time to pursue the subject with the chairman.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Brademas?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to add my own to the several expressions of high regard to Congressman Poage, who is one of the top leaders not only in Congress, but in our country in the field of agriculture. I want to make a comment in line with the expressions of concern that the chairman of the Agriculture Committee has already heard from members of this committee in respect of the resolution that your committee has sent over.

We were, I think, somewhat astonished by the tone of that resolution because, as has already been indicated, some of the best friends of the legislation of Chairman Poage in the field of agriculture sit before him on this committee. Indeed, I note that in the 90th Congress so far we have not yet considered any major commodity legislation and so far as I now know, there are no plans that we should do so in the remaining months of this Congress. In any event, I am given to understand by people wiser than I in these matters that the explanation for this apparent lack of legislative activity lies in the provisions of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1965, which was aimed at supplying commodity arrangements for a number of products—wheat, cotton, wool, dairy products, feed grains, and rice for 4 years rather than the usual 2 years.

I assume that the reason that was a 4-year rather than a 2-year bill was that persons as skillful and as knowledgeable as the gentleman from Texas, Chairman Poage, looked at those Democratic majorities back in 1965 and decided to make hay while the sun was shining.

In fact, that bill passed the House by a vote of 221 to 172, and the Democratic members of the House Committee on Education and Labor voted for it by 13 to 5. Northern Democratic nonfarm Congressmen voted for that bill by a vote of 99 to 36—again supplying the margin of victory.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the gentleman will yield there. The gentleman from Mississippi, the author of this resolution, voted for a recommittal against passage and against the conference report on that bill.