

Mr. LEIGHTY. I would say very frankly to you that the railroads have seen fit to conduct their negotiations from one focal point, and that there isn't any one man who can handle a situation of that kind.

Mr. BROWN. If it were legislated, however, that this were not within the realm of possibility without being a monopoly on the part of the railroad, would the union be in a position to profit from that kind of regulation or would management be in a position to profit from that kind of regulation?

Mr. LEIGHTY. I don't quite understand your question.

Mr. BROWN. If you made it a monopoly practice to bargain on a nationwide basis rather than railroad by railroad, would the pressure be greater on the management or on the union to settle disputes?

Mr. LEIGHTY. I don't think that makes a great deal of difference. The difficulty with national handling of it, as I see it, is that it does give the railroads an opportunity to refuse to make a settlement and create what may be considered an emergency, a national crisis, and endeavor to force compulsory arbitration upon us, which we certainly cannot willingly accept.

Mr. BROWN. I am not sure that answered my question.

Mr. LEIGHTY. I think insofar as national negotiations are concerned, as they have worked out in the past, it has been advantageous to both of us. I think it has helped us materially; it has helped the carriers materially. It has prevented, in my opinion, a great deal of chaos.

For example, the organizations go on the Santa Fe Railroad and get an increase of 20 cents an hour. Then the employees on the Southern Pacific go in and say, "No, we will not settle for 20. We have to have 22."

Mr. BROWN. Is it possible that there are conditions on one of the railroads that would necessitate 22 rather than 20 cents an hour?

Mr. LEIGHTY. There is a possibility of that kind. I would say that generally speaking national negotiations are beneficial to both sides.

Mr. BROWN. I would have to differ with you only to the extent that I think national negotiations, the nationwide character of the emergency we now find ourselves in, is a contributing factor to the circumstance. I think we are a bit off the subject.

Let me ask you a question relating specifically to House Joint Resolution 559.

Do you agree with the way the Board is constituted under House Joint Resolution 559, a five-member totally public board, with one member having some background in labor, and one member having some background in management?

The legislation apparently doesn't say railway labor or railway management.

Do you accept that?

Mr. LEIGHTY. I don't think it needs to be railway labor. I think probably it is advisable because we often find that these public boards come up with recommendations which most of us agree would be entirely impractical. By having a labor representative and a manage-