

Secretary WIRTZ. I have just one question. That would be an offer which is submitted by a Government agency to the membership?

Mr. ADAMS. It would be the last offer of the parties, similar to what is done under Taft-Hartley, and submitted to the membership directly for vote.

Secretary WIRTZ. I have never thought about bypassing the union processes to get a membership vote.

Mr. ADAMS. And the counteroffer back?

Secretary WIRTZ. The vote thing I would be opposed to, and the formality of saying that there is to be a final offer—I neither oppose it nor approve it.

Mr. ADAMS. You will assume this has been done and you have the last stated positions of the two parties. What is your position with regard to, instead of 559, saying at the end of this period—

We will have the Board appointed. It will take the Fahy Panel recommendations and build upon them in the same fashion that Resolution 559 does. At the end of the period the public offers, the statement of the Board, would be made public, and the parties would have a period of 10 days within which to negotiate.

At the end of that period, if they did not, then there would be sanctions applied that both dislike, which would be to continue your injunction, require the panel to set up the terms and conditions, and to seize.

Secretary WIRTZ. To seize the company or to seize the company and the union?

Mr. ADAMS. To seize the company and to impound profits during this period of time, freeze bonuses and to freeze, in effect, both parties.

Secretary WIRTZ. I would be opposed to that.

Mr. ADAMS. Why?

Secretary WIRTZ. Because I don't see equity in it and I don't see necessity in it.

Mr. ADAMS. I would say this to you: If one party is in favor of the proposal that is being made, and the other party has indicated its opposition to it, why do you think this type of proposal will make them both negotiate?

Secretary WIRTZ. I want to know which party is right. One may be right and the other may be wrong. Without making that assessment, to suggest equality lies in satisfying both of them goes beyond my understanding.

Mr. ADAMS. No; not satisfying both of them. Satisfying neither of them and applying pressure to both. You stated, and I agree with you, that House Joint Resolution 559 is requiring the littlest possible interference in the collective bargaining process.

What I am saying is that by applying the littlest possible interference with the process in a national emergency strike, we simply will not get both to continue any further bargaining. Why should they?

Secretary WIRTZ. The point is that I don't see the fairness in treating equally just one side that may be right and I don't know which side is right.

Mr. ADAMS. I haven't passed on the merits at all.

Secretary WIRTZ. That is the point. I don't see how we get equality by dealing equally, according to your statement, with two parties, one of whom may be reasonable and the other unreasonable.