going through eight different Presidents, and no Congress has ever seen fit to have it happen. I am sure this Congress would not see fit to have it happen either.

Mr. LEIGHTY. By the same token, there has only been one law passed by the Congress in connection with compulsory arbitration, and that was in a dispute which the railroads initiated.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dingell?

Mr. DINGELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Leighty, can you give us for the record your estimate of the cost package in terms of dollars and cents, the total to the railroads, of the railroad proposals, the demands by labor, the suggestions of the Fahy Panel, and any other recommendations that have been made by the National Mediation Board?

Would you submit those?

Mr. LEIGHTY. Yes; we will submit that. It will take a little while to develop that information, 2 or 3 days, possibly.

(The information requested follows:)

Submitted herewith by the Railway Labor Executives' Association are approximate estimates of the total cost of various settlement proposals in the railroad shopcraft dispute:

I. Carrier proposal of Mar. 28, 1967:

5-percent general increase for 1 year from Jan. 1, 1967, $39,620,000.

No figure can be assigned for the potential cost from a job evaluation study.

II. Union proposal of Apr. 18, 1967:

6½-percent general increase and 12½-cent inequity adjustment for skilled skilled men for 1 year from Jan. 1, 1967, $76,506,000.

5-percent general increase and 12½-cent inequity adjustment for skilled men for 1 year from Jan. 1, 1968, $68,412,000.

III. Fahy mediation panel proposal of Apr. 21, 1967:

6-percent general increase and three 5-cent inequity adjustments for skilled men (as of Apr. 1, 1967, Oct. 1, 1967 and Apr. 1, 1968) for 18 months from Jan. 1, 1967, $93,816,000.

Mr. DINGELL. I am aware of that. I would like to have it in the record.

Mr. Chairman, it would be highly appropriate to have similar information submitted by the railroads and also by the Department of Labor or the Department of Transportation, so that we can make some judgment as to the relative dollar costs here involved.

Gentlemen, I am curious to know why is it necessary that we have a nationwide railroad strike instead of strikes of individual railroads?

Mr. LEIGHTY. That is a very good question.

Mr. DINGELL. You are aware of the practice in the auto industry where a strike involving contract termination does not necessarily close down all the auto producers. It would close down one and perhaps two.

Mr. LEIGHTY. Let me explain this to you, Congressman.

Mr. DINGELL. Don't forget, I am under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. LEIGHTY. Maybe they will charge the time to me. I won't take that long.