

recognition of the authority of the ICC. But the practical answer is "Yes."

Mr. DINGELL. The practical answer is "Yes."

Now, with regard to this matter, Mr. Secretary, it is also a fact, is it not, that the railroads would have no income, were there to be a strike, during this period? Am I correct?

Secretary WIRTZ. During the period of the strike they would have no income?

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct.

Secretary WIRTZ. Certainly not from the operation of the railroads.

Mr. DINGELL. Were there to be a strike, the employees would have the option of entering other industries and continuing their employment; am I correct, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary WIRTZ. That a striking employee would have the option to take another job?

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct.

Secretary WIRTZ. That is correct.

Mr. DINGELL. It is also demonstrable, I believe, Mr. Secretary, that the railroads support compulsory arbitration; is it not?

Secretary WIRTZ. There will be other witnesses before the committee who can better answer that than I can.

Mr. DINGELL. But it is a matter of common knowledge that this fact is so, is it not?

Secretary WIRTZ. I defer.

Is it expected that there will be representatives of the railroads?

The CHAIRMAN. There will be.

Secretary WIRTZ. I would not care to testify about their feeling on that point.

Mr. DINGELL. Has the administration discussed House Joint Resolution 559 with the railroad industry?

Secretary WIRTZ. I am trying to think. It is always dangerous to state a negative. I think the answer is a flat and unqualified negative, so far as I know.

Mr. DINGELL. Would I be able to assume that the industry does support House Joint Resolution 559?

Secretary WIRTZ. I don't know what their position will be. The indication, as I have seen it in the newspapers, is that they will not oppose it.

Mr. DINGELL. Which would mean that we would be passing legislation violently opposed by one side and supported by the other, assuming that statement is correct?

I am not trying to coerce you on this subject.

Secretary WIRTZ. If you are not, I would have to point out the difficulty that I have with the logic. The fact that somebody may support something that may be good and somebody else may support something that may be bad doesn't make it an inequitable rule without going to the qualitative judgment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Secretary, I know my time is most limited but I have one more question to ask at this time, and then I would ask the Chair to grant a further 5 minutes.

Do you make the flat statement that the previous legislation passed by this Congress, Public Law 88-108, was not compulsory legislation?

Secretary WIRTZ. Do I make the statement that it is not?