

only significant consumers of coal are the electric utilities. Coal has provided between 70 and 80 percent of the fuel need for electric power generation in our State for the past 10 years. Coal's share has been unaffected by the imposition of import controls in 1959 and could not and would not be affected by the removal of these controls given the limitations of existing conversion facilities. Thus, in Rhode Island the coal industry has not been helped by the import controls and it would not be hurt if the controls were removed. However, the people of Rhode Island have been seriously hurt by the controls. According to a study by Petroleum Industry Research Foundation, Inc., with which most oil importers agree, the price on residual fuel oil on the east coast would decline by more than 20 cents a barrel if the restrictions were lifted. For the small State of Rhode Island, which consumes 6.3 million barrels of residual fuel oil—in 1963—for industrial, commercial, and residential purposes, this would have meant a savings of about \$1.25 million in just that year, and more in future years, as the demand for this product rises. The lower fuel costs would also make the State's industry more competitive. This applies particularly to the hard-pressed textile industry, Rhode Island's largest industrial consumer of residual fuel oil.

There is absolutely no justification for continuing this restriction which helps no one but hurts many. Certainly the coal industry, whose domestic and export sales have been rising very rapidly since 1961, does not need it since the great bulk of its markets are located in areas beyond the reach of imported residual fuel oil. The Interior Department, which is administering the oil import restrictions, has called public hearings on the subject for March 10 and 11. It is to be hoped that fact and reason will prevail over mispropaganda at this hearing and that the administration will finally see fit to remove the wasteful and burdensome restrictions on the importation of this essential commodity.

In closing, I want to go on record by saying that we in New England are sick and tired of being taken advantage of on the overall subject of the vital supplies of energy that we need for our economy. While I have confined most of my remarks to my State, Rhode Island, according to my calculations residual fuel oil import restrictions are causing every New England consumer of electric power and energy to pay higher costs. A conservative annual estimate of the tribute being paid to the selfish and prosperous coal mine owners by New England is in excess of \$15 million per year. At a time when we are fighting for our economic life, not only in the domestic United States of America, but also in world markets, there is no justification for this tribute. Also, the taxpayers of New England will now have to help finance the Appalachia program. While I have the greatest sympathy for the unemployed people in that area, the basic cause of their unemployment is the automation program adopted by the coal mine owners, the result of which is that one miner can now do the work

that three miners did 10 years ago. While we are on this subject of tribute, according to the report to the President by the Petroleum Study Committee dated September 4, 1962:

It has been estimated that complete abandonment of controls could lead to a reduction in the price of domestic crude oil of \$1 per barrel (approximately the world price) since the total demand for petroleum products in the United States is approximately 3.5 billion barrels annually, it is apparent that the present system of controls involves a large cost to consumers.

New England consumers are being forced to share this burden. Finally, even though residual fuel is a byproduct of the domestic oil industry, some misguided domestic producers have joined forces with the coal industry and are fighting the importation of residual fuel oil which is in such dire short supply in this country. These same producers are all fat cats because of the 27½-percent depletion allowances.

I think it is about time that we in New England stood up and fought for our rights. If we do not get at least some relief by the elimination of residual fuel oil import restrictions, then we all should take a second look at the subsidies that are being given to both domestic coal and oil by the long-suffering New Englander taxpayer.

(Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. YATES' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PLACING AGRICULTURE ON MORE EQUAL FOOTING WITH OTHER SEGMENTS IN THE ECONOMY

(Mr. REDLIN (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, unlike other producers, the individual farmer cannot control the supply or the price of his commodity, because he is one of millions producing a homogeneous product. This economic fact is painfully typical of the wheatgrower, who watches helplessly as supplies mount and prices drop, while the cost of living soars upward.

In the farm program we have devised a mechanism to achieve supply adjustment and a more equitable return for the farmer. We have a duty to review the farm programs constantly, with an eye toward improvement.

Under existing programs, the farmer is falling behind the general prosperity pace. As a grain- and livestock-farm operator, I have experienced the cost-price squeeze. I have watched farm income remain the same or decrease, and at the same time, have observed the upward trend of real estate taxes, labor costs, and prices for machinery and supplies.

Today, I am joining with the gentleman from Texas, Congressman GRAHAM

PURCELL, chairman of my Wheat Subcommittee, in introducing legislation that focuses attention on the cost-price squeeze. The bill writes into the law an "escalator" to link price supports with the general price level. Each year, automatic adjustment would be made to reflect changes in the economy.

Mr. Speaker, in industry many labor contracts provide for salaries to follow the cost-of-living index. The farmer should be entitled to similar consideration.

In extending the voluntary wheat certificate program, the legislation we are introducing today would insure the wheatgrowers a \$2.50 return on the share of his production consumed in the United States for food, restoring the principle that the farmer is entitled to full parity. The bill provides for a 25-cent certificate on his share of export wheat for a minimum of 500 million bushels.

In addition, the "escalator" adjustments would be made automatically each year to key wheat income to the rhythm of the general economy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this proposal has good potential for meeting the cost-price squeeze and placing agriculture on a more equal footing with other segments in the economy.

THE LATE TIM CONWAY

(Mr. SWEENEY (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep humility and sadness that I speak of a man who was known to all in our hometown of Cleveland, Ohio, as Tim Conway.

Timothy J. Conway has passed from this life and his going has left a void in the community and in the hearts of his friends and fellow citizens.

We all knew Tim Conway as a man of great spirit and deep faith. He was a man in the great American tradition who, through his own drive and ambition, attained success in life and who, through his sense of obligation and responsibility, devoted his outstanding talents to the betterment of his community and fellow man.

Tim was a dedicated Christian and leading Catholic layman who was awarded papal honors as a knight of St. Gregory in 1963. He found great satisfaction in helping hundreds of needy through his position as director of Catholic Charities Corp. of the diocese of Cleveland.

As a civic leader, Tim Conway utilized his talent for organization in many ways. He was director for years of our fine Cleveland zoo and an active supporter in its development.

Tim's interest in sports was well known. From a youthful sandlot player he became treasurer of the arena and of the Cleveland Hockey Club. He was a major stockholder in the Indians, and it pleased his fine Irish humor to note that he could again get into the games free, referring to the days as a boy that he

and his pals would sneak into the old league park. His concern in helping the youth of Cleveland was evident in his support of a sandlot team, which was called the terror of the leagues.

Tim Conway displayed his ambition and business acumen early in life when he joined the Fisher Foods Co. 50 years ago as a \$16-a-year clerk, and his great drive and energy brought many improvements in the operations of his company, which grew to become a \$100 million business as he rose to become president of the company.

This man, Timothy J. Conway, was one of those rare persons who wholeheartedly gave of himself. Thousands of those whose lives he touched, directly or indirectly, join in paying homage to him and in extending heartfelt sympathy to his family, whom we hope will take comfort in the knowledge that their grief and loss is shared by many.

THE WHEAT ACT OF 1965

(Mr. PURCELL (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, during most of the past 20 years, America's wheatgrowers have been subsidizing those of us who eat bread. Last year, as almost 20 years ago, the farmer's return on the wheat in the bread we eat was less than 3 cents a loaf.

But during that period, the price of bread has climbed steadily. The marketing spread has increased over 80 percent. Had farmers received an equal share in that increase, they would be receiving nearly \$4 per bushel for the wheat in the bread Americans eat.

That price—for wheat covered by domestic wheat marketing certificates—stands instead at barely \$2 per bushel. It is clearly apparent that farmer's prices have not governed bread prices.

Without a wheat program it is probable that the farmer's average price would be near 90 cents per bushel for the wheat he could market.

Over 50 percent of all wheatgrowers, with about 75 percent of the Nation's wheat acreage have chosen to participate in the voluntary wheat certificate plan during the 2 years it has been available.

The merits of the voluntary program are widely recognized. The concepts of the program are more acceptable to farmers than were those of the mandatory control plan, which was rejected in the last wheat referendum.

The cost to the Government of operating this program is about \$300 million less per year than we have been paying in recent years. The certificate provisions raised farm income by \$450 million above the level otherwise in prospect for 1964. Similar results are in prospect for the 1965 crop. Through voluntary acreage diversion and increased exports we have cut the burdensome surplus of wheat by 36 percent since 1961.

Farm income from wheat at a level of \$2.2 billion again this year as last, is

barely the average of the past 10 years. It is painfully apparent that that average is too low. Thousands of wheatgrowers are on the verge of losing their farms.

If we are to continue to enjoy the fruits of abundance produced at low cost through our system of efficient family farms, we are going to have to pay an American price for the wheat we eat. Much of the world regards American agriculture as the supreme achievement of our people and Government working together. We can no longer afford to see efficient farm producers short-changed in our marketplaces.

Today, the parity level at which wheat should be selling is in excess of \$2.50 per bushel. We can no longer afford to pay less for wheat for domestic use. Wheatgrowers can no longer afford to subsidize consumers to the extent they have in the past.

The time has come that we must pay that price. If that price is translated into an increase of 1 cent per loaf in the price of bread, it will mean each of us paying only \$1.35 per year to continue to buy food at less real cost than the people of any other country pay. It will be the financial salvation for thousands of family farms.

The alternative is clear in the financial statements of wheatgrowers, and in the analysis of the men who lend them money with which to farm.

Farmers have made a supreme effort to meet the financial challenge of a constant price level for their production. They have increased yields per acre of wheat by 50 percent since 1950. The gains they might have made have been offset by increased costs for almost everything they buy in increased quantities in order to raise production. Without an American price for an American farm product, thousands of efficient, hard-working wheatgrowers can no longer survive.

The mechanism to accomplish this imperative need is already in existence.

A few simple changes in the voluntary wheat certificate plan in effect for 1964 and 1965 can provide the price wheatgrowers must have to survive.

Today, I am introducing a bill that can effect those vital and imperative changes. The bill is proposed as the Wheat Act of 1965 to continue, indefinitely, the voluntary wheat certificate plan along the lines of the program we have had for the past 2 years.

Important changes in the present legislation would, however, be provided.

First, the price of wheat for domestic use would be set at \$2.50 per bushel for 1966. Thereafter, adjustment would be made as the Secretary determined to be appropriate, taking into consideration any change in the gross average hourly earnings for manufacturing labor.

In addition, a 25-cent export certificate on a minimum of 500 million bushels would be available to growers participating in the program.

There would be one other major change, in that the diversion payment plan would be eliminated. This would result in a further cut in Government costs for the program but would be more

than offset by the increased value of the domestic wheat marketing certificates.

The price support for wheat not accompanied by marketing certificates would be at a level to be set in consideration of two factors, the world price of wheat, and the feeding value of wheat in relation to support levels for feed grains.

The cost in terms of prices to consumers would be small. The savings in costs of Government operation of the program would be substantial.

With these changes, the program can provide farmers cooperating in the voluntary certificate plan a price they must have to continue producing. It will be an important step toward providing the economic strength our family-farm system of agriculture requires and deserves.

STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

(Mr. NIX (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I feel it incumbent upon me to bring certain pertinent observations to the attention of my colleagues and to the citizens of our country who are deeply interested in our relationship with Vietnam.

There are many loyal and outstanding Americans in my district, which is the Second District of Pennsylvania, who feel that immediate negotiations is the proper method of solving one of the most serious situations that the world faces today.

I, therefore, incorporate their views as a part of my own statement.

The explosive situation in Vietnam which now threatens the peace of the world grew out of the failure to stabilize the area along the lines proposed by the Geneva Agreements of 1954. Following the French defeat, the country was divided along the 17th parallel and an exchange of populations took place. The Geneva agreements provided for free elections to be held in South Vietnam in 1956 and ruled that no foreign troops were to be introduced. While the United States was not a signatory, we agreed to abide by these conditions.

It was in the hope of encouraging the development of a popular, democratic, and stable government in South Vietnam that the United States took up its role in that blood-soaked country, supporting Ngo Dinh Diem as its Premier.

Historical, political, religious, and sectional factors have prevented the development we sought. It is clear now that the Diem government was an obstacle to the political and economic reforms the South Vietnam people desperately needed. Had these reforms been instituted, it is unlikely that the Vietcong could have developed their present strength, nor gained the popular support they now obviously command.

Because of opposition by the Diem government, the free elections scheduled for 1956 did not take place. For the first 6 years after 1954, despite the development of civil war, we limited ourselves to the small number of advisers permitted under the Geneva agreement. But between 1961 and 1964, the character of our

involvement changed both qualitatively and quantitatively, until now there are 23,000 American troops in Vietnam—a clear violation of the prohibitions we agreed to in supporting the Geneva agreement. By whatever name we call it, we are now involved in an undeclared war in Vietnam whose potentialities for escalation and for involvement with both the Chinese and Russians must make every thinking person pause to reflect.

Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, reminded us in a speech in the Senate, February 17, that even in Korea, where the United States lost 157,000 dead and wounded and spent \$18 billion, we had to go to the conference table.

We have learned in Europe that there are sharp and specific differences between the Communist and Socialist states, although all were once considered mobile satellites of Russia. Yet, we have made no such considerations or deductions relevant to southeast Asia. We must realize that the Vietnamese, as well as citizens of other countries on the Chinese border, have feared and mistrusted the Chinese for centuries and that their desire to become dominated by China is hinged only to the last resort: they must have China to side with them in a war.

Nowhere in the world today is it realistic to generalize about the Communists in a brush stroke, or to think of communism only in terms of the power plays made by Stalin after World War II. Senator CHURCH stated in his February 17 speech:

The reasons why our policy has failed to produce the desired results in so many parts of Asia and Africa is that there is so different an attitude in Asia and Africa toward the Western World. These continents have just emerged from centuries of colonial bondage.

We must reconcile ourselves to this fact.

We have expressed fear that accommodation to the natural forces that exist in Vietnam would mean "losing face." We must very soon realize that this notion is incorrect, that accommodating a Vietnam deciding its own destiny is the only way to save face. I think French Premier Charles de Gaulle offers us the best example of graceful withdrawal. Certainly no ally of ours is more conscious of prestige and saving face. He did know when it was time to free France from a bloody and costly war, and to allow Algeria to work out its own system of self-government. Among our leaders who were aware of the realistic necessity for France to face up to its responsibility and negotiate a settlement in Algeria was Senator John Kennedy, whose speech for a free Algeria could be applicable to Vietnam today.

Is it possible that Ho Chi Minh could control 5,000 Vietcong troops who have moved into South Vietnam, even if he wanted to? And what of the 35,000 hard-core fighters of the Vietcong? It was they who fought the French before and are now fighting us. Can we consider them so tightly tied to Hanoi or to Peiping or to Moscow? I think not. This is a guerrilla war and the guerrilla troops are Vietnamese.

To those who think that now is not the time to negotiate a peace settlement,

I would like to refer to a talk of U.N. Secretary General U Thant, February 24. In his plea for negotiations now, he asserted, the American public does not know all the facts, stating that "in times of war and of hostilities the first casualty is truth." In urging negotiations, he did not advocate an immediate withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. He said that stability had to be established first. Nevertheless, chances for a settlement grow dimmer with each passing day, for no talk of settlement is brought to the conference table.

As our bombing moves into the north, it becomes more likely that Vietnam will have to respond militarily. Our business of reprisal raids which destroy a greater amount of human life and property than were destroyed in the Vietcong raid originally, unfortunately lead us to think of the retaliation of the Nazis during World War II, when they killed 10 members of the French resistance whenever a German soldier was killed. I am not saying that our responses recently were even nearly as inhumane in intent as the Nazi's retaliations, but I do remind you that this kind of total retaliation to people fighting for a cause can only intensify the struggle materially and psychologically and, in this case, when a settlement must inevitably be hoped for in the hearts of all of us, this procedure only lessens the chances for peace.

In response to bombings, the Vietcong is best able to strike on the ground, and very possibly is able to successfully strike the capital, Saigon. And if we send in American troops, we can expect Chinese troops. Then we must contend with China, whether on the battlefield or at the conference table. With a spreading war, negotiation becomes more difficult and use of nuclear weapons becomes a more likely and monstrous possibility.

We who want peace, and who refuse to admit that a major war is inevitable, must see that now is the point in time when we must come to grips with the possibilities for peace. Conference table sessions have never been so eminently needed.

A cease-fire should not require an immediate withdrawal of troops, until such time as the United Nations can shoulder more of the existing responsibilities. A peace with these conditions, retention of Americans in South Vietnam, should be negotiated now and the troops must be the emissaries of this peace. This is the way to save face.

RACIAL BIAS, BRUTALITY IS A NATIONAL TRAGEDY

(Mr. MOELLER (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States spoke last night for all responsible Americans when he declared that there must be no further delay or compromise in the struggle to extend full voting rights to those of our people whose skins happen to be dark.

I support the proposed legislation to insure equal voting rights for all qualified men and women. I support it line by line, paragraph by paragraph and section by section. I support the spirit and substance of this long overdue and critically needed measure. And I stand ready, willing, and anxious to accept the President's challenge that we work long hours, nights, and weekends to pass it into law.

It is a national tragedy that legislation of this kind is required at all. The Constitution of the United States already guarantees our people the right to vote, regardless of color and regardless of place of residency. The Constitution does not say that the State of Alabama or the State of Mississippi, for example, are accorded special dispensation to trample on the rights of Negro citizens.

Article 15 of the Constitution does specifically state, in language easy to understand: that

1. The right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Let Congress heed the command of the Constitution. For the right to vote has been denied to Negro citizens for decade after decade, for generation after generation. It has been denied them by subterfuge and by trickery. It has been denied them through naked aggression and soul-searing repression. It is being denied them today in Selma, Ala., and all the other Selmas of America.

I have nothing but admiration for the wave after wave of Negroes that have marched resolutely against tear gas bombs and police dogs, who have willingly risked death, injury, and imprisonment to secure what is already theirs—the right to vote.

And I have nothing but contempt, lasting and utter contempt for the bitter and cruel little men, the rabble-rousers and spreaders of hate and dissension who have drawn the line in the dust and decreed that come hell or high water the Negro will go on being treated as little more than cattle.

The United States is one nation, indivisible. The entire country suffers when a good man is beaten to death in Alabama, when three young Americans are murdered in Mississippi for the "crime" of practicing Americanism, when the civil liberties of a whole race are violated.

The United States, as a whole, suffers when the Wallaces and the Barnetts and other men of their ilk defy the Constitution and all that it stands for.

These "ugly Americans" glibly try to defend their irresponsible actions by crying "States rights" and by charging that the civil rights movement is a "Communist plot." But there is no defense against the deliberate provocation of hate and dissension, there is no defense against wanton brutality, there is no defense against the systematic enslavement of an entire race of people.

The outright falsehood that the civil rights movement is being directed by the Communists has been demolished by no less an authority than the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and this Nation's foremost expert on the workings of communism. He said this in a speech as recently as December 12, 1964, in New York City:

Let me emphasize that the American civil rights movement is not, has never been, dominated by the Communists—because the overwhelming majority of civil rights leaders in this country, both Negro and white, have recognized and rejected communism as a menace to the freedoms of all.

But Mr. Hoover did say, in the same speech:

We must be ever alert to the activities of the Klu Klux Klan and the racist groups that would trample upon the rights of their fellow man. These cowardly jackals, who attack only the weak and the outnumbered, have earned the contempt of every genuine American. * * * Concerted effort, understanding, logic, and reason must prevail over hate, bigotry, and intolerance.

Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to every word said by Mr. Hoover in this connection. I say myself that the Wallaces and the Bernetts are doing more to aid the cause of communism than all the imaginary Communist agents that they profess to see in the civil rights movement.

Now, I repeat my strong support of the administration's voter registration bill. I think also that the time has long since come when the Federal Government must move and move promptly to guarantee the safety of all our people.

I think that the murder or beating of any American exercising his right of petition under the Constitution should be made a Federal crime. It is obvious that some States have no intention of prosecuting the "cowardly jackal" that Mr. Hoover referred to in his speech of December 12.

I think that State officials themselves who maliciously and willfully defy the Constitution and the Courts should be dealt with in the same manner as any other individual who commits crimes against the Government.

In short, the time has come to serve unmistakable notice that the greatest government on earth no longer will permit the subjugation and degradation of the citizens it is sworn to protect.

The racial issue has been fanned, enflamed, and kept alive for more than 100 years now by self-serving extremists and "supremacy" organizations. They have succeeded in pitting race against race and region against region. They have made a mockery of the only reason this country was founded—and that reason, unique in history, was to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

But a full 20 percent of our people are strangers to equal justice; 20 percent of our people do not live in tranquility; 20 percent of our people have been rigidly denied the blessings of liberty.

This Nation has been able to find ways to plumb the ocean depths and explore the mysteries of the universe; it has discovered cures for many "incurable" dis-

eases and has succeeded in harnessing the energy of nature and putting it to work for the good of mankind. Our America has grown and progressed and prospered as no other country has since the dawn of history.

But, we still have not learned the simple truth of the Golden Rule; we still have not learned to live in peace and harmony with our fellow citizens; we still blindly refuse to recognize the dignity of man.

I am convinced, however, that the darkness of intolerance and bigotry is waning. I think that good people everywhere—North and South—are just plain sick and tired of the hate and suspicion and disunity that comes in unending torrents from sick and twisted minds.

America has accomplished much in the last 180 years. But its greatest and most desirable accomplishment still lies ahead, just over the horizon. And that accomplishment will be the binding up of the wounds that split and divide our country. Then we can get on about the business of making this truly the land of liberty and opportunity. Most Americans will settle for nothing less.

SITUS PICKETING BILL

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the situs picketing bill which I have introduced today has been pending before the Congress of the United States for many years. The problem to which it is addressed arose in April 1949, when the National Labor Relations Board made its unfortunate decision in the Denver Building and Construction Trades case (82 NLRB 1195). From that date, some 16 years ago, the injunctive processes of the courts have been employed to limit seriously the economic rights of the trade unions in the building and construction industry.

A situs picketing bill to restore the economic rights of the building and construction trades unions has been pending before the Congress for many years. Such legislation has received strong support from both sides of the aisle. I refer to the message of President Eisenhower dated January 11, 1954, in which he recommended "that the act be clarified by making it explicit that concerted action against an employer on a construction project who, together with other employers, is engaged in work on the site of the project, will not be treated as a secondary boycott." Similar messages were sent on January 23, 1958, and January 28, 1959.

The bill has, of course, had the strong support of both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

It will be recalled that a commitment was made during the course of the enactment of Landrum-Griffin for the consideration of this legislation by the House and the Senate. This commitment was made formally on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 3, 1959, when then Senator Kennedy, our late President, stated:

I have received the assurances of the majority leader [Mr. Johnson] and the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] that if the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reports the bill [situs picketing bill] they will schedule it. Likewise, both the Speaker of the House [the late Mr. Rayburn] and Representative HALLECK have said that they will use their influence to secure a rule for the consideration of the bill if the House Committee on Education and Labor reports it. (Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Thursday, Sept. 3, 1959, p. 16416.)

The bill came on for consideration by the House Committee on Education and Labor which favorably reported the bill in report No. 1556 of the 86th Congress, 2d session—parts 1 and 2. The legislation did not proceed further, however, because of a difference within the labor movement concerning the drafting of certain words in the bill.

I am pleased to state that at the recent Executive Council Meeting of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations an agreement was reached between the various groups in the labor movement on the drafting of the bill. Specifically, the Building and Construction Trades Department has agreed with the Industrial Union Department on the resolution of the issue and the executive council of the AFL-CIO has approved the agreement and stated its support for the legislation.

There is substantial opinion that the Supreme Court of the United States may have relied too heavily on the administrative expertise of the National Labor Relations Board in its decision of the Denver Building Trades case. It must be remembered that the Denver Building Trades case arose early in the administration of the act by the National Labor Relations Board.

Perhaps the clearest legal justification for the bill is to be found in the excellent legal reasoning stated by Judge Fahy, a former General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, and a former Solicitor General of the United States, who wrote the unanimous opinion of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in this very Denver Building and Construction Trades Council case wherein Judge Fahy concluded that the picketing at the site of construction was not a true secondary boycott. Judge Fahy stated the issue and its appropriate resolution as follows:

The final problem, therefore, is to determine whether the action here was of a secondary or primary character. If the former the Board properly ordered its cessation. If the latter its order should not be approved. The usual secondary boycott or strike is against one who is not a party to the original dispute. It is designed to cause a neutral to cease doing business with, or to bring pressure upon the one with whom labor has the dispute. It seeks to enlist this outside influence to force an employer to make peace with the employees or labor organization contesting with him. The situation before us is not of this character. The picketing and resulting strike were at the premises of the contractor where the subcontractor's men were at work. It grew out of a controversy over the conduct of the contractor in participating in the bringing of the non-union men onto the job as well as over the conduct of the electrical subcontractor in employing them. The purpose of the council was to render the particular job all union. It was not to require [electrical subcon-