

Anyway, it is your opinion that up to this point the whole process has not been exhausted and sometime in the future it would be legally possible for the President to invoke the 60-day clause, is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am trying to find out where you stand in this thing. That is my purpose in asking the particular question.

Mr. GILBERT. I may have been a little facetious when I said I did not know what has happened, so much has happened that could affect us. That is the reason for the type of answer I gave.

Mr. SPRINGER. Are you in the process of bargaining over wages?

Mr. GILBERT. No, sir.

Mr. SPRINGER. This is altogether a question of working conditions and the number of people who may be retired or laid off, is that the problem?

Mr. GILBERT. At the present time, Congressman, the only thing that is in evidence in relation to the manning issue is our Notice No. 1 which I outlined in here. The court has set aside our Notice No. 2 that was referred to and then we have a Notice No. 3 containing request for training program for apprentice firemen (helpers).

Mr. SPRINGER. Are you a part of the proceeding here for wages and improved conditions? Are you a part of this six or eight brotherhoods?

Mr. GILBERT. No, sir; we are not.

Mr. SPRINGER. You are not involved in that dispute at all?

Mr. GILBERT. We are not.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am trying to limit, to find out where you are as distinguished from the rest. Do you anticipate being in a position to bargain on this later or is that an issue at all?

Mr. GILBERT. Well, we reached a settlement in November concerning wages. Now we are free to initiate a request for changes in rules and in July we will be free, again, to institute another request for wages.

Mr. SPRINGER. In other words, pursuant to the ending date in November pursuant to the act?

Mr. GILBERT. Yes. Pursuant to the negotiations that were initiated in January of last year.

Mr. SPRINGER. You are not testifying as a member involved in this present dispute but based upon your experience of what you believe is in the public interest, is that right?

Mr. GILBERT. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Van Deerlin.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. Gilbert, would you give us an opinion on the Adams-Moss-Dingell substitute resolution that was introduced about 10 days ago in this matter?

Mr. GILBERT. I am sure I am not qualified to give you an opinion about the ramification of that as such. I have read it and there are certain provisions that I see are objectionable because of the manner in which the seizure may take place. If there is a seizure to take place we believe it should be an executive seizure rather than a court seizure and that both sides of the dispute should be treated alike.