

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes, sir; I do feel that very strongly.

Mr. BROWN. But ultimately we must get into permanent legislation.

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes. I think that is right. The only reason I draw back is that if this were to connote permanent legislation of this same type, I would not be convinced that that is the right answer to it. The consideration of the longer range problem, yes, I think should be taken.

Mr. BROWN. Permanent legislation aimed only at avoiding a recurrence of the threat of a nationwide rail strike?

Secretary WIRTZ. I wouldn't go into it that much. We are so much along the same lines in our thinking that I hesitate to seem to differ. I would suggest only that that consideration take account of the kind of thing that was referred to here earlier in our conversation and discussion, the whole of the collective bargaining, not just the sanctions in this case.

Mr. BROWN. One final question.

Mr. PICKLE. Would the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. BROWN. If I can get in this line of questions before my time expires, I would be delighted.

Mr. MACDONALD. You don't have terribly much time.

Mr. BROWN. If I may finish my question, then, please.

We have the same problem, do we not, cases in extremist with references to the trucking industry, some communications industry, some parts of the communications industry, and others, perhaps not as severe as the rail strike, but to a relative degree; is that correct?

Secretary WIRTZ. Not current.

Mr. BROWN. Not current, but the possibility is there.

Secretary WIRTZ. The problem centers, in my judgment, in the transportation industry. It includes the newspaper industry, it includes the defense plants, particularly.

Mr. MACDONALD. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Adams?

Mr. ADAMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PICKLE. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMS. In just a moment I will, Mr. Pickle.

Mr. Secretary, you testified to one of the other questions that the last meeting was on April 27 between the parties.

The reason I ask this question is because you have indicated that even in public interest strikes you do not believe we should take, in effect, the lid off collective bargaining and require public disclosure of last positions. I would like to know this:

This, and I happen to disagree with you on that—

Secretary WIRTZ. So do I disagree. I think public disclosure is a good thing and it is contemplated by this resolution in connection with the hearing at the end of 60 days. I think it is a good thing. I am sorry I misunderstood you.

Mr. ADAMS. I will ask you this question, then: Has there been a later proposal submitted after the Fahy proposal to the two parties? If so, what was the result?

Secretary WIRTZ. I would be very reluctant to answer that and would do so only on the express instruction of the committee and only after advising the committee that to answer the question at this point