

The general increase for the first year (6-½ percent) together with the inequity adjustment would raise the average hourly earnings figure from the present \$2.92 to \$3.20; and the 5 percent (and the inequity adjustment) for the second year would raise this figure to \$3.45. The cost of the general increase would be:

For the 1st 12 months.....	\$52, 060, 000
For the 1st 18 months.....	100, 010, 000
For the 24 months.....	147, 960, 000

The vacation change (same as Emergency Board) would be:

For the 1st 12 months.....	\$2, 740, 000
For the 1st 18 months.....	4, 110, 000
For the 24 months.....	5, 480, 000

The cost of the inequity adjustments would be:

For the 1st 12 months.....	\$25, 000, 000
For the 18 months.....	50, 000, 000
For the 24 months.....	75, 000, 000

The total cost would be:

For the 1st 12 months.....	\$79, 800, 000
For the 18 months.....	154, 120, 000
For the 24 months.....	228, 440, 000

Mr. Moss. Mr. Secretary, in talking about precedents, when did the last railroad strike, national in character, occur without the immediate threat lurking in the background of either seizure or a congressional intervention?

Secretary WIRTZ. My answer would be that I don't suppose there has been a situation of that kind in our history, at least in the history of the last 4 or 5 years. To be sure I understand your question, you ask when has there been a nationwide strike without a threat of legislative action in the background?

Mr. Moss. I confined it to railroads.

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes, confined to railroads. I know of none.

Mr. O'NEILL. The shopcrafts in 1922.

Mr. Moss. So we really haven't, if we want to regard free collective bargaining as dealing across the table, agreeing by parties, free to employ their economic powers in order to finally force a settlement, we have really not had that kind of bargaining, have we?

Secretary WIRTZ. Correct.

Mr. Moss. The proposal here would postpone until January 1969 a settlement of some of the issues, those issues unresolved on the 91st day after the enactment of this legislation, if it is enacted, is that true?

Secretary WIRTZ. I am not sure about what you said. The present notices in this case will be covered by the action under the resolution.

Mr. Moss. I will tell you very candidly, sir, that I was under the impression, and I believe I sat through every session of the hearings in 1963, that it was the clear intent of this committee that we were dealing with a temporary settlement, and that we were not prejudicing the rights at the end of 2 years of either party. But we do have a decision by Judge Holtzoff intervening that says that we had a different intent. Am I correct?

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. Moss. What assurance have we that in January 1969 we could not have a similar decision by another court?

Secretary WIRTZ. I would find that assurance in the difference between the issues in that case and in this one.