

many people have protested so much to try to prove to, I don't know who, that there isn't this compulsion that you are talking about.

Secretary WIRTZ. I would not be one of those.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. A gentleman in the other body made a statement yesterday which I understand the unions gave him a pretty hard time about. He said, "We are doing everything to prevent compulsory arbitration."

Secretary WIRTZ. That is a different point.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Let me change gears. I don't think there is anyone here that compulsory arbitration is not repugnant to.

You have stated that, and we all feel the same way. I think all of us are looking for a realistic out on the thing. We have referred to January 1, 1969. Some partisan politicians might say a few weeks after the election. You have stated that you did not see that there was any more difficulty in arriving at a new contract at the end of this contract which was more or less a compulsive contract.

I don't see how you can say that there would be no more difficulty, because it would seem to me that they would have the old, unsettled situation still with us, and new ones that had arrived in the interim.

What is your stand there? You said there would be no more difficulty.

Secretary WIRTZ. Several things, but taking just our last point first, I understood the question to be what would their legal status be as of January 1.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I think that is what I wanted to make very clear. There would be no difference.

Secretary WIRTZ. I want to be sure about the significance as to the date, with the reference to the election. That doesn't surprise me at all. But you should know that this is the date which covers the demands of the two parties.

It seemed only appropriate that the authority of the Board here be an authority which permitted them to cover the demand of both parties—the unions' demand and the companies' offer—for 2 years. So that is the reason for that date.

I would not suggest that it would be any harder for them to reach an agreement on January 1, 1969, than it would otherwise. I think that was your point. I do not think it would be harder.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. In other words, you do not feel that the unsettled part of this particular round of negotiation would hang over into the new agreement?

Secretary WIRTZ. It would not. It would be quite similar—as this would work out, this settlement would be in the same situation that the others are. There are different patterns. There was the 1966-67 round, which we are here trying to complete. All of those will come up.

As for the election, a good many cases are going to come up in January 1968, and some more in June 1968. My only point is that this would put this case in the same pattern as the others.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. You use the term that we are here trying to complete. I think there is a difference of opinion here as to whether this would complete it or not. This would only suspend it.

Secretary WIRTZ. It would complete this round. You see, the other unions have made agreements which run to, some of them, January