

Mr. IGNATIUS. The issue must resolved. Seizure would be an alternative. In my judgment, it is not as satisfactory an alternative as that which has been proposed under the joint resolution.

Mr. OTTINGER. Does it not equally solve your military problems?

Mr. IGNATIUS. Our interest, of course, is in insuring that our supplies are moved. But I would think that the resolution of the issue, either through completion of the collective bargaining, as Congressman Friedel said, or by means of the joint resolution, would be preferable to seizure. I think there are other problems associated with seizure that are not present if the joint resolution is passed.

Mr. OTTINGER. Do those problems relate to the movement of military goods?

Mr. IGNATIUS. I haven't addressed in detail that question, Mr. Ottinger. But I am of the opinion that there would be new problems associated with seizure that would not be present under the joint resolution. I fully support that as the preferred means as opposed to seizure.

Mr. OTTINGER. I think it inappropriate, unless you are coming here to testify on the labor issues, that you extend yourself beyond the question of the movement of military goods and the necessity of our defense posture. It seems to me that otherwise you are getting clearly into another area with which we are charged, but which you say you want to avoid.

Mr. IGNATIUS. I think I understand the point you are making. There was a seizure some years ago and it is an alternative. Although I was not in the Department at the time, there was a period of operation under those conditions.

Mr. OTTINGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brown?

Mr. BROWN. As a newspaperman, you realize if I were editing your statement, Mr. Secretary, I would leave it as it is up until the last line. I think Mr. Ottinger has put his finger on the problem.

If you are not testifying on labor-management negotiations but merely on whether or not the country can afford a strike in these perilous times from the standpoint of the Defense Department, then I would have left off that last sentence of this statement, perhaps.

Let me ask you, then, with reference to whether or not the country can tolerate a strike at this time—and I want to be perfectly clear on your viewpoint—any conclusion on the part of this committee or on the part of the Congress to take a strike, I gather, damages our defense posture in Vietnam and our maneuverability with reference to any action this country might wish to take in the Mideast; is that correct?

Mr. IGNATIUS. I think given the current circumstances, we cannot have a national rail stoppage.

Mr. BROWN. Would you go so far as to call such an eventuality irresponsible?

Mr. IGNATIUS. I would say that the parties certainly have an obligation to attempt to reach agreement. If that doesn't occur, there must be found some other means of insuring a continuation of national rail service.

Mr. BROWN. Can I conclude from what you just said that any unwillingness to negotiate or to meet together on the part of management