

We claim an interest in the bill; we claim that it involves the subject matter over which we have a responsibility and we claim we have an interest in this bill and that we are concerned about the passage of the bill and that from the standpoint of the majority of our members, a rather overwhelming majority, that we felt that it was unwise to pass it.

Now, we know that there are arguments in favor of it. We know you would not have spent the time on it without arguments in favor of it. We know that there are reasons on the other side. We have seen very few pieces of legislation come before this House where there weren't two sides. We have felt that we had some responsibility to express a viewpoint that is contrary to some other peoples' viewpoint.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, we recognize that the resolution adopted by your committee and your statement completely eliminate any question of a jurisdictional argument. But my feeling is, and I am constrained to state it:

I was most upset by the manner in which your committee expressed this view. I am not easily surprised and I am not terribly old-fashioned, but in my 14 years in the House such a resolution is unique.

I asked the Parliamentarian of the House if he recalled in his many years of experience similar action having been taken. He seemed to remember vaguely that there was similar action taken in one instance over, I believe, a stockyard act, but the resolutions adopted at that time related solely to jurisdiction, which in yours is absent. That would lead to the conclusion, barring some obscure case that the Parliamentarian didn't remember and I haven't been able to find, that this resolution is a first.

Mr. O'Hara?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have just one more point.

The real point, Mr. Poage, is that your committee has chosen to act collectively rather than to assert the very great influence that all of your members have individually on the opinions of members of this committee. We now find ourselves considering a resolution from a committee that has not proven to be very friendly to us in the area of labor legislation, and that has some effect on how much weight we give to the resolution.

For example, the last time that this committee reported out and the House passed an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act, it was for the repeal of section 14(b) of that act. We took a look at how Agriculture Committee members, who are now telling us what to do with the present amendment to Taft-Hartley, voted and we found that on your committee the members voted 23 to 12 against repeal of 14(b), and the Democrats voted 12 to 12. In other words, half of the Democrats were with us and half against us. But almost 2 to 1 your committee, which now has passed a unanimous resolution, said that this committee was all wet and would not go along with it.

Now, in addition to that, this committee worked for many, many months and carried to the floor the very difficult job of updating and revising the Fair Labor Standards Act, the so-called 1966 minimum wage bill; and again the committee which is now telling us by resolution what to do with labor legislation, voted 25 to 6 to kill our bill, to recommit it. It also distresses me to see members of the majority voting to kill a bill, an action which I think most of us avoid except in the most extreme case, because we have to *exerciser à l'eff-*