

Your question is whether I am in a position to say to you whether there will come to the Congress proposals for permanent handling of this matter?

Mr. KEITH. Yes.

Secretary WIRTZ. No, I am not. There have been no bones made about it. The President has several times referred to the fact that we have been considering that problem very actively. He has referred pointedly to the fact that not all of us agree within the administration on that. Paralleling that, I would think, the views of this committee and the country.

But I would deal with this important point, that we have it very much under consideration. Whether the President will address formal proposals to Congress or not, I don't know. I can only say to you that there is active consideration of that question.

Mr. KEITH. Certainly in an era such as we now live in, with our military commitments as extensive as they are, there should be some end in sight to the seemingly endless prolongation of labor management disputes in essential industries.

What alternative approaches are there to the one that you have before us today? I understand that a professor from the Yale Law School has suggested that there be some way to penalize or to reward, or to perhaps effect some magnifying of the benefits and payments, to the participants during the waiting period.

Is this a matter on which you are informed?

Secretary WIRTZ. The reference, I think, is to Prof. Neal Chamberlin's suggestion some time ago, not in connection with this case but more generally, that he would favor arrangements which, in effect, have an amount of money set aside covering the mediation period and if they don't reach agreement within the period, they both lose it.

This traces back to a suggestion made by Professor Gobles of Illinois University in 1949. It has had a good deal of discussion. It has always been rejected as being gimmicky. Professor Chamberlin has in his most recent public statement expressed his feeling that it just doesn't work out.

I think one of the principal problems is that it sets up in escrow an amount of money which has a pressure on both parties beyond just the pressure to settle.

It is intriguing, however. I think professional opinion has been to reject it. I don't mean to reject it out of hand.

Mr. KEITH. Can you perhaps suggest to this committee and its members some other imaginative approaches, gimmicks or otherwise, that might shed some light on this?

Secretary WIRTZ. There is a group of suggestions, Mr. Keith, with quite a variety about them. The other one in the same category which has attracted most attention, I think, is a proposal that at some point both parties should state their final position, and that the third party should be required to take one of those positions or the other, whichever the third party thinks is the best.

That, too, has been developed with various refinements. I think, again, without attracting any substantial support.