

Mr. DEVINE. Yes.

Let me put it this way: Are we creating another board—well, as you know, at the President's request we granted a 20-day extension and then a 47-day extension and now at the President's request this will be a 90-day type of situation with a 2-year expansion to it. What I am trying to say is this: I think the Congress is getting sick and tired of these bandaid types of remedies to situations, where perhaps the parties are not collectively bargaining in good faith.

It seems to me that some of the parties are using the recommendations of the President's Emergency Board and other boards as a floor from which to commence negotiations. I don't know whether this is going to solve the situation we will be in in the future. In the last 3 years there have been three or four. But when does it become too often?

Secretary WIRTZ. I sympathize completely with your reference to the bandaid. I don't think it is a matter in which anyone takes any pride. All of the resources of the Department of Labor, the three members of the National Mediation Board, three members of an emergency board, three members of a special mediation panel, their services have been brought to bear on this situation. Now we come along with a proposal for another. I think the bandaid suggestion is a good one. I think you would agree, too, that we don't want to amputate until we have to.

Mr. DEVINE. I would agree we don't want to amputate, but when the parties, and I would refer to both of them in this sense, turn to Congress every time a recommendation of a Presidential Board is made to which both of them don't agree, for us to answer the solutions, the Congress is going to be driven to a point that perhaps they will pass what might be considered as restrictive legislation.

I don't think we should preoccupy ourselves with words like "don't use compulsory arbitration," they don't like it.

I think we are probably going to have to face up to it one way or another. I am not sure that this is the way to do it.

Secretary WIRTZ. I guess the President in his message anticipated this question and answered it better than I have. He said at the end of his message:

We must take this action now as we continue and renew our search for a just and general solution to emergency strike or lockout problems in our country.

Mr. DEVINE. Did he say that when sending up this bill, or the 20-day bill, or the 47-day bill?

Secretary WIRTZ. When he sent up this bill.

Mr. DEVINE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Moss.

Mr. Moss. Mr. Secretary, there seems to be emphasis given to the fact that we have twice previously in this current dispute granted extensions.

Don't you think the record should reflect those extensions, the circumstances?

The first one was at the request of the President of the United States, in order to avoid embarrassment to the Government of the United States, that we grant 20 days. This would be equated with the 80-day period provided under Taft-Hartley. He had long been scheduled to attend an International Conference of the American States in Punta