

As I mentioned in my testimony, a good bit of the basic materials which are moved by rail are moved for export. We have had considerable concern over our balance-of-payments situation for quite a number of years. This would have an immediate and dramatic impact on that.

As you may know far better than I, a number of our manufacturing industries utilize the railroad as a pipeline, as a warehouse, in effect, and the automobile companies, for example, I am advised, bring material in, component parts, right off the rail cars into their production line. This would have an impact on automobile manufacturing.

Mr. SPRINGER. Since I only have 5 minutes to question you, could you give me any idea, and I believe this is what the committee is interested in, on how your rate of employment would be affected, at the end of 72 hours, at the end of 7 days, at the end of 2 weeks?

Could you give the committee those figures? It would be helpful in getting the impact. That is what we are interested in. I am hazy from your testimony thus far as to what would be the impact on the employment.

Secretary BOYD. I provided the figure of 6½ million at the end of 30 days. I do not think we can give you a figure on 1 day or 2 days, particularly if one assumes that the strike will not really be a strike.

Mr. SPRINGER. Six and a half million at the end of 30 days is what rate in percentage of unemployment? Can your expert give it if you cannot give it?

Secretary BOYD. I will ask him to work on it.

Mr. SCOTT HARVEY. I can't give it to you right now, sir, but in 1963, when the rate of unemployment was considerably higher, the Council of Economic Advisers said that the additional unemployment would produce an overall unemployment rate of 15 percent.

I don't have the figures right now, but we will provide them for you.

Mr. SPRINGER. Are you thinking in terms of the same thing now?

Mr. SCOTT HARVEY. I don't have the figures, sir.

Mr. SPRINGER. Would you supply them to us?

Mr. SCOTT HARVEY. Yes, I will.

Secretary BOYD. Yes, Mr. Springer.

(For information requested see letter at end of testimony (p. 108).)

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask your adviser this question: Would there be any reason why it would be any greater or any less today?

Mr. SCOTT HARVEY. Assuming that the rate of unemployment now is lower now than in 1963, the total unemployment rate would probably be lower.

Mr. SPRINGER. I see.

I have never understood, Mr. Secretary, and I assume as Secretary of Transportation you are interested in the general wage schedules—

Secretary BOYD. General what?

Mr. SPRINGER. Wage schedules.

Secretary BOYD. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPRINGER. This has been raised in this committee and I have never understood it.

For instance, is there a reason why—and maybe your economist can help out on this—a reason why, for instance, in Chicago, which I take it is the hub of the transportation industry in this country, that there would be a wage differential which would be substantial, we will say,