

be under their jurisdiction with respect to their wages and working conditions.

Mr. POAGE. I think the chairman misunderstands me. I am not now, nor at any time have I contended that this committee did not have the proper jurisdiction of this bill. We raised no jurisdiction question.

Mr. THOMPSON. You stated that clearly. I don't take exception to anything you have said, despite the fact I don't agree with all of it, any more than you do mine. I have tremendous respect for you.

Mr. FORD?

Mr. FORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I was distressed when I saw the remark by our good friend, Chairman Poage, regarding doubts of members of the Agriculture Committee that they could receive a hearing here. We have had occasion in recent months to experience quite a bit of very helpful cooperation for Mr. Poage in passing legislation that is not at all popular in the part of the country that he represents. This committee is certainly no less mindful of its obligations to people who stand up and are counted when it is important, Chairman Poage, than any others.

I hope we will never forget that. But I wonder if perhaps we should have a Kaffeeklatsch with your committee sometime and let them see that we don't have horns; 22 members of your committee voted for this resolution, which is about as strong as anything one might imagine coming out of one committee directed toward another.

It draws a number of very strong conclusions and shows a certain amount of misunderstanding on the part of the members of that committee with respect to this legislation and the true conditions that exist which this legislation is directed toward. In any event while this committee held extensive hearings on the legislation during the first half of this Congress, only two members of the Agriculture Committee, both Democrats, came to this committee with a statement. Only two members felt strongly enough about the legislation to express an opinion either for or against the legislation which frankly, Mr. Chairman, is not legislation at all if it excludes farmers, because it really makes an amendment to include agricultural workers.

If you take that provision out, there isn't a bill. We would be passing not even a title and I think a point of order might be raised against it.

The two statements that were inserted in the hearings by members of your committee indicate similarity to some of the statements made in the resolution adopted by the committee. I assume, since Mr. Abernethy has been identified as the author and he was one of the two members, that that is the explanation for it.

I took a look at the statements here as we were listening to you during the early part of the morning. Some of these things we have covered pretty thoroughly and I have commended the exchange between the members of this committee and Mr. Matt Triggs, the representative of the Farm Bureau, who testified at great length and who pointed out to us that he was representing the small farmers. We went into the problems that he, as the spokesman for the largest organization in membership of farmers in the country, had. As a fairly new member of the committee I was most interested in his assertions and reassertions of the support his organization has given for the adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act. This is what we are talking about amending here—the Taft-Hartley Act, now called the National Labor Relations Act.