

very real difference between the parties at this time, which I should not want to prejudge.

But it is quite true that the development by the parties, with some variety of position about it, of nationwide bargaining here, does contribute to matters of this kind.

Mr. BROWN. Would it be within the province—

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

Mr. BROWN. May I finish my question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. Would it be within the province of the Congress to give consideration to legislation which might outlaw industrywide bargaining in such industries as adversely affect the national interest when we get to that strike threat situation?

Secretary WIRTZ. I want to be sure, when you say would it be within the province of the Congress to consider that, do you raise a question as to authority or as to wisdom?

Mr. BROWN. If you would like to answer on both issues, I would be pleased to have you do so.

Secretary WIRTZ. On authority, I would think there would be no question about it.

On wisdom, I think it would present a very important question. I would not commend any easy moving toward a prohibition of it.

Mr. BROWN. Do you consider the question of compulsory arbitration or seizure more important?

Secretary WIRTZ. You say more important.

Mr. BROWN. More fundamental?

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes, I think so.

Mr. BROWN. I gather that you would put that last on the list in a choice between compulsion and seizure and monopolistic bargaining?

Secretary WIRTZ. I would think a constructive approach to the question of sounder collective bargaining in this industry could very well start with consideration of the fact that as things now stand—with a nationwide approach to it—collective bargaining loses its typical motive power, which is the power of one side or the other to say no, and to hurt the other party before it hurts the public.

That is too long a statement. But a basic factor here is that now the exercise of economic force by either side has nationwide implications.

I think you come very close to the heart of the problem when you refer to that point.

Mr. BROWN. If I can just finish this question by asking it in this way, am I to assume that you are suggesting that nationwide bargaining in the rail industry is a given?

Secretary WIRTZ. I do not assume that it is a given. I am being too careful, but I mean to say to you that if there is consideration of what ought to be done by way of amendment of legislation, or by development of different private practices, I would start with the consideration of problems of the kind you have raised rather than with the problem of what kind of castor oil dosage—compulsory arbitration or seizure—and to try to get at the roots of the problem rather than at this ultimate sanction.

Mr. BROWN. In other words, you would prefer this consideration to compulsory arbitration or seizure?

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Blanton.