

ticular case because the particular negotiation which has been going on is rather rigid and rather set, set in concrete, I guess.

Why wouldn't it be desirable, Mr. Secretary, to have a law that would have this flexibility, that would give a series of choices, that would provide an arsenal of weapons to try to bring these things to a culmination?

I assume what you are saying is that it would be well for us to consider it, although you may not be in favor of it right now; that it would be well for our committee to consider it.

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes, and I would go on to add that the pattern which is followed here is more like the pattern in the bill you have introduced than it is like any of the other patterns which have been introduced. It does have the important distinction, in my judgment, of tying it to the bargaining.

I don't think of that as inflexibility here, and, therefore, a disadvantage. I think of it as an advantage because it draws on what the parties have already done.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Secretary, I would request that you and the administration give to me your comments on the measure that I have recommended. Would you do that?

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. PICKLE. One last question: On page 6 of your testimony you made a very strong point that this resolution "provides that if a determination must eventually be made by someone other than the parties, that determination will be drawn from the record of the parties on bargaining in this case." I think that is a good point.

My question to you is this: Are you saying that you would take from the Mediation Board and the Emergency Board the right to consider the various offers involved in dispute, or that you would choose one or the other? Would you either choose the pros or the cons of the case, or would you give that much leeway?

What do you mean when you say "limited to the determination of the parties on the bargaining"?

Secretary WIRTZ. I do not mean that they would be held to a position taken by either party. I do mean, in answer to the first part of your question, that their discretion would be very sharply limited, and even if they felt, just to be specific, or if they found that the parties had come within the distance between A and B, and if they felt that the right answer was outside that area and was over at C, they would not be permitted to go outside that area which the parties had found in their own bargaining.

Mr. PICKLE. Thank you.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Watson?

Mr. WATSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, although the committee members have been quite pointed in their questions, I am sure I reflect the sentiment of those who would express it here, that we are grateful to you for the very able and knowledgeable manner in which you have handled this problem.

I would only venture one comment: I don't see why these parties haven't gotten together, because you have been quite persuasive here this morning.