

Mr. BROTZMAN. Did I understand that you were a part of some committee or some meeting relative to this subject?

Secretary BOYD. I said that I sat in on two meetings of groups who has been working on this matter for some time. I can't honestly tell you whether I am now a member of the group or what.

Mr. BROTZMAN. I don't want to betray any confidential communications, but can you tell me who was working with you on that?

Secretary BOYD. No, sir, I am not at liberty to do that.

Mr. MACDONALD (presiding). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Satterfield.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Boyd, I don't think there is any question here that the No. 1 consideration before us is whether or not this Nation, in terms of its national interest, can afford a strike.

In this sense, I would like to follow up a statement you made to a question posed by the gentleman from Colorado.

As I understand it, you have stated, in essence, that a strike would not destroy this country, but that it would be too great a burden to bear based on the issues between the parties.

Secretary BOYD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Am I to infer from this that if the issues were different, or perhaps the parties were a little further apart on the issues, that this burden then might be justified?

Secretary BOYD. I make no judgment on that, Mr. Satterfield. I am merely trying to relate my testimony to the facts and have made no judgments on other contingent possibilities which do not exist.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. In your own opinion, if this strike were to occur, do you believe it would develop a national emergency?

Secretary BOYD. Yes; certainly I do, depending on the duration of the strike. A nationwide rail strike of any sustained period, I think, would constitute a national emergency.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Then the whole thrust of your statement this morning—I take it from that answer—is that, aside from the issues that might be involved, a strike of undetermined duration would produce the type of emergency that you feel would be against the public interest?

Secretary BOYD. I think any strike, in the light of the circumstances of these negotiations, would be detrimental to the public interest. I think a strike, regardless of the issues, of any sustained period, would be a national emergency.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. In the final analysis, the issues between the parties really don't obtain, in determining whether or not from the standpoint of national interest we can afford a strike?

Secretary BOYD. Not in terms of impact; no, sir.

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Thank you.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Satterfield, would you yield for a moment?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD. Your answer to Mr. Satterfield, Mr. Secretary, was that said with knowledge of the telegram that was sent to the Department of Defense and acknowledged, that they will not interfere with anything necessary for defense in Vietnam or anyplace else, or any health movements?