

one opinion he gave which intrigued me. I want to see if you agree with it.

He said that he felt that the mediators—I believe he used the term “mediators”—everybody connected with this at the White House were using their influence not to go above 5 percent. He uses these words further, that this year the President is trying to keep from going above 5 percent, or set the limits of 5 percent as he set the limits for 2½ percent last year in the airline strike.

To correct my statement, I believe it was three and a half rather than two and a half.

Mr. BIEMILLER, you were in the airline thing last year, do you have an opinion on this?

May I say that he also told us that the economic advisers in the White House were influencing the administration and everybody connected with this to not go above 5 percent.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I have not been intimately enough concerned with the details of the bargaining, if you can describe it as such, that has gone on. Hence, I am in no position to answer that particular question.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask you one further question?

He said, further, that he felt that those at the White House who were working on the economics of this thing, including the economic advisers to the President, were trying to limit this to 5 percent, not more than 5 percent, for the reason that you are going to have other large groups who are going to negotiate later in the year; namely, the United Auto Workers and; second, the Steel Workers.

Do you have an opinion on that?

Mr. BIEMILLER. The only thing that I can possibly think that that would be based upon is the recent speech by Mr. Ackley in which he sort of sounded a general warning to the Council of Economic Advisers that the concept of guidelines for wages was not dead.

The AFL-CIO has always taken the position that we did not agree with the whole theory of guidelines for wages. If this is an issue in this controversy, we would be opposed to the position that allegedly is, according to the testimony you refer to, being taken by White House economic advisers.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have just one thing further to cover, Mr. Chairman. I am trying to get at the major issues, if I can.

You take the position here that this is not compulsory arbitration?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Pardon me?

Mr. SPRINGER. That this is compulsory arbitration. I beg your pardon.

I am much intrigued, may I say, by the distinguished Senator in the other body. I read from the May 4 issue of the Congressional Record, at S6403, where he uses these words—

Mr. BIEMILLER. It so happens we have that here.

Mr. SPRINGER. All right.

In the final draft of the President's proposal for ad hoc emergency legislation which he called for this morning and is now recommending to Congress for consideration, meeting on the legislative front the threat of a nationwide stoppage of the railroad system, I am pleased to see the President has carefully avoided these two extremes—

And he used this statement:

First, this proposal does not seize the railroads. Second, this proposal does not ignore the negotiations which have already taken place. Third, this proposal is not compulsory arbitration.