

Secretary WIRTZ. You are legislating the authority——

Mr. DINGELL. To make findings regarding wages and working conditions which would be binding for a period of 2 years.

Secretary WIRTZ. I think the answer to your question is yes.

Mr. DINGELL. Absolutely.

Secretary WIRTZ. No, not absolutely. I will be glad to develop that in its context, but when you add absolutely, I am not talking absolutely.

Mr. DINGELL. Just a moment, sir. We have the most limited amount of time.

Secretary WIRTZ. Enough for the full truth, Mr. Dingell, and when you say absolutely, my answer does not include that word.

Mr. DINGELL. All right. I will put the word in, Mr. Secretary. You and I are good friends, but we are entitled to differ on this matter and to differ in short because we have a very brief amount of time.

But compulsory arbitration is simply the legislating into the hands of an arbitration board the power to make a finding which will be binding upon the parties to a labor dispute for any period, whether it be permanent or temporary in nature.

Am I correct?

Secretary WIRTZ. No, sir. The logic, Mr. Dingell, respectfully and under the terms that you put it, the logic of that proposition is that that you and I grew up on, the false logic, that a man has two legs, an ostrich has two legs, therefore, a man is an ostrich. That is not right.

Mr. DINGELL. I am not making the statement that a man is an ostrich. I am just saying that we are legislating into the hands of a body, a labor body, the power to make a finding which will be binding on the parties for a period of 2 years.

Secretary WIRTZ. That is one element, a 1 percent element in this case.

Mr. DINGELL. That is also, Mr. Secretary, a definition of compulsory arbitration, is it not?

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Secretary WIRTZ. My apologies, Mr. Dingell. You will realize the importance of the point to me.

Mr. Moss. You mentioned there have only been three out of 300,000 cases that have been brought to the Congress.

Secretary WIRTZ. We estimate 100,000 collective bargaining agreements a year, so it would be three cases out of 400,000 in these 4 years.

Mr. Moss. Aren't you now applying the logic of the ostrich and the man because you are looking at quantity and not quality, you are not looking at the cases as they are defined, the nature of them, the scope of the involvement of the Nation's interest.

So the comparison becomes meaningless excepting as an exercise in statistical gymnastics.

How many railroad disputes have been settled in that period of time without being brought to the Congress?

Secretary WIRTZ. Would you like it in terms of the number of cases or the number of parties? This is national. There have been a large number of them during this period.

Mr. Moss. The one which properly defines——