

Mr. KORNEGAY. Does that same area of dispute lie in the negotiations where three-fourths of the unions accepted the offer?

Mr. GREENOUGH. The same situation existed. I am not familiar with the degree to which it was pressed in the negotiations.

Mr. KORNEGAY. What I am really getting at is were the issues the same?

Mr. GREENOUGH. I would say basically the same. We have other skilled crafts. We have certainly train dispatchers, block operators, all of the crafts that are represented on my railroad by the Transport Workers Union having skilled crafts in them. While this issue was perhaps discussed—and Mr. Wolfe could comment on that—

Mr. KORNEGAY. In other words, settlement was reached on the question of the issue of inequities as well as the issue of the pay scales?

Mr. GREENOUGH. That is correct.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I note with a great deal of interest that as a result of Mr. Macdonald's suggestion yesterday that the parties voluntarily agree to submit the unresolved issues to final and binding arbitration, that Mr. Wolfe, representing the railroads, has agreed to that suggestion by Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. GREENOUGH. That is correct.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Have you heard anything from the unions as to what their position would be on such an arrangement?

Mr. GREENOUGH. I have heard nothing this morning.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Do you know whether or not the suggestion or idea has been transmitted to the unions?

Mr. GREENOUGH. I think the issue has been discussed many, many times. To the best of my knowledge, the unions have never been agreeable to it.

Mr. KORNEGAY. In this suggestion, I assume that it means a new arbitration board; in other words, new personnel on the board as opposed to those who have been working on this problem for some time. Is that correct?

Mr. GREENOUGH. I would assume that.

Mr. KORNEGAY. In your statement you have set out the proposals or alternatives which have been discussed, and I think two will be considered by the committee in executive session: No. 1, doing nothing and seeing what happens; and No. 2, the seizure.

No. 3 is the resolution which we have before us which would continue collective bargaining to provide for an agreement, and that would be a binding arbitration on both parties at the end of 2 years.

On the second proposal, that of seizure which has been suggested by certain members of this committee, and which has been suggested by certain witnesses, you feel that that would not be an appropriate procedure.

One of the reasons I note that causes you to disagree with this is that it would weigh more heavily upon management than the unions inasmuch as the only sacrifice that the unions would be making under such an arrangement would be the delay in receiving the increased wages. You go on to say that such practice usually makes settlements retroactive.

I would like to put out this hypothetical for you: In the event seizure seems to be the course of action, what would your feelings be if it were spelled out in a bill to that effect, that the settlements or the