

Mr. SCHOENE. They are not directly involved in this dispute, but there are some other organizations that have not settled their current wage dispute.

Mr. DEVINE. Let us get to a few items at this point.

Yesterday, Mr. Ramsey, in his statement, said:

On behalf of the members of all the organizations, I wish to express our most vigorous opposition to the administration's bill, H.J. Res. 559.

Do you represent opposition to this bill, too?

Mr. SCHOENE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DEVINE. You also said that this legislation is just what railway management wants.

Mr. SCHOENE. Yes, sir; and I think that is true.

Mr. DEVINE. Prior to this legislation being introduced—and I was amused a little about your comment about the press notices surrounding this particular resolution—a number of us from this committee, and some key Cabinet people were called to the White House—there is no secret about that—prior to this legislation being introduced.

We read about it on the way down there, about what was going to happen. But when you say this is just what railway management wants, do you feel that President Johnson is management-oriented in this picture?

Mr. SCHOENE. No, I don't think it would be fair to characterize the President that way.

Mr. DEVINE. Let us take some more people who were there. Secretary of Labor Wirtz was there, and his right-hand man, Jim Reynolds, was there. Do you think those two gentlemen are management-oriented that they would support something that is just what management wants?

Mr. SCHOENE. I don't think there is a promanagement orientation of any of the people who were there. I think they did their best to advise the President of what they thought was right. But what they came up with—

Mr. DEVINE. Let us go just two or three more steps.

Mr. Katzenbach, the former Attorney General, was there. A former Secretary of Labor, a former Justice of the Supreme Court, and now the Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Arthur Goldberg was there apparently in support of this.

The Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, who didn't take a position for or against but who did suggest it was constitutional was there.

I find it difficult to believe that these people would all be in support of something that is "Just what railway management wants."

Mr. SCHOENE. I can't escape the conclusion that that is what they came up with, even though I say I do not accuse them of conscious bias. But the record before this committee speaks for itself.

The railroads certainly are advocating the enactment of this bill. Their conduct up to this point, in relation to this dispute, as well as their record since 1950, shows that they are in favor of compulsory arbitration.

It is true, I think that it would be more pleasing to the railroads if they could get a bill that would substitute compulsory arbitration generally for collective bargaining in the handling of railway labor disputes. They would like that even better.