

would make my utility as a mediator in this case zero. That may be a low price to pay.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Secretary, I think it is a high price. We will discuss it here in the committee. It goes to the basic points we just mentioned. You and I both agree that public disclosure is a good thing, but you take the position you should not do it here and I respect that and would not go farther until we have discussed it in committee.

But I think it should be contemplated as something that we will certainly be discussing to have you do. If the public doesn't know where the parties finally are, it puts a very different connotation on the whole picture.

Secretary WIRTZ. I am sorry I lost that point in your first question because I would agree with that point very strongly and would point out that it is reflected to a considerable degree in this suggestion.

Mr. ADAMS. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Thank you for yielding.

In answer to the gentleman from Ohio's question a few moments ago you said you wanted to limit your discussion primarily to this specific resolution, although you did think it would be proper and in order for this committee to later consider permanent legislation.

But you just now said you would not recommend this as permanent legislation, nor anything similar to it. You had told me a day or two ago, on Monday, that you weren't recommending anything in particular. I wanted to be sure that you weren't saying whatever we passed upon would never be considered again. It might or might not.

I assume that is your intent. My measure, I think, is "somewhat similar." But at the same time, if we are not to discuss it now, I would respect that. I want to be sure you are not ruling that out. You don't intend that?

Secretary WIRTZ. You have stated my position exactly.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ADAMS. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Dingell?

Mr. DINGELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I think there is another very important point to have careful consideration of. If you will, direct your attention to section 5 of the bill. It says if an agreement has not been reached by the parties upon expiration of the period specified in section 6—

The determination of the Special Board shall take effect and shall continue in effect until the parties reach agreement or, if agreement is not reached, until such time, not to exceed two years from January 1, 1967, as the Board shall determine to be appropriate. The Board's determination shall have the same effect including the preclusion of resort to either strike or lockout as though arrived at by agreement of the parties under the Railway Labor Act.

At the conclusion of the 2 years, if the parties have not reached agreement, would it be necessary for the parties to serve section 6 notices under the Railway Labor Act?

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes, I think it would be.

Mr. DINGELL. Then upon conclusion of the 2 years, the parties would be compelled to wait another additional period before they could engage in any strike or management could engage in lockout.

Secretary WIRTZ. You are right, and it is a very important point.