Mr. Carter. There is a problem now of the Congress pulling the administration's chestnuts out of the fire as they did twice before, when the administration might well have the power, as it did in 1950, to accomplish the same thing now as it did then.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Pickle.

Mr. Pickle. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I am glad to see you before the committee and I

appreciate your statement this morning.

Going back to one of the earlier questions with regard to the inability of the present parties to get together, it was my understanding, according to the newspaper report, that just before the first extension was granted, five out of the six bargaining unions had reached agreement, and one had refused to agree to the offer.

Do you know which one of these groups did not want to have an

Secretary Boyd. I have no information on that, Mr. Pickle.

Mr. PICKLE. I wonder if the gentleman with you knows.

I am advised that it was the Mechanics or that group, the Shop Workers. Is that correct?

Mr. Scott Harvey. I am not aware of the fact that it is. I think

you will have to ask that of the union members themselves.

Mr. PICKLE. I would like to have that put into the record, too. I just wonder if it is the same group that was party to the five-airline difficulty we had last year.

Secretary Boxo. My belief is, Mr. Pickle, that the only source for

that information would be the brotherhoods themselves.

Mr. Pickle. Then you wouldn't have any comment as to whether this is a power play between unions?

Secretary Boyn. I have no knowledge on that subject.

Mr. Pickle. We have talked a good bit in the last several questions about Government and what powers the Government would have with

relations to seizure.

I am speaking as one individual. It seems to me like we are just chasing rabbits. We are doing a lot of talking about what the Government does or does not have with respect to seizure, hoping we would have some authority to prevent the country getting completely tied into a catastrophic knot. But whether we have that power or not, it seems to me like all you are trying to say, in terms of seizure, would be that that would be more palatable.

My thinking is if we do not pass 559, as I see it, the only alternative then would be, one, that the Congress do nothing, and just let the country get into a complete breakdown of transportation with respect to rails; second, the Government, if it has power, would have to go into some kind of a seizure, and if we don't pass this bill the only alternative, in effect, would be for the Government somehow or another to try

to have seizure.

My question is: Wouldn't it follow-on, then, that if we don't do something, if we don't pass this resolution, that inevitably this committee and this Congress is going to have to consider the possibility of passing something that would be compulsory arbitration?

Secretary Boyd. I think you have outlined what the possible choices

are, Mr. Pickle, very clearly.