

Mr. FRIEDEL. I suggested that, but we only have one side present.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of inquiry to the Chair, do I understand that it is your plan, Mr. Chairman, to contact the chairman of the full committee prior to the termination of this hearing this morning to see if something can be worked out, as has been suggested here, and failing to accomplish this, then Mr. Rogers will put a formal motion so that we can vote on it, or do I understand that we will have consideration of this sometime today and then Mr. Rogers will put his motion at some future meeting of this committee?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Sometime today.

Mr. BROWN. It would have to be during a committee meeting.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. I am willing to yield my time to Mr. Rogers.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman. I won't take 5 minutes.

I would hope that we can do this this morning before we adjourn. Perhaps if there are representatives of those negotiating for labor who could commit to this, maybe they could come forward shortly and give us their agreement to enter into voluntary arbitration.

If not, I think we ought to take whatever steps are necessary to get whoever can speak for them to let this committee know if they can agree. Here one side says they are willing to go into voluntary arbitration. It has been suggested by members of the committee, such as Congressman Macdonald and others on the committee, perhaps Congressman Dingell would also agree along with other members who have already stated their approval, that this would be a good move to make, to get them in voluntary arbitration to settle this thing, which it has been indicated could be settled very shortly if they go into voluntary arbitration.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS. Are you referring to voluntary arbitration or are you referring to, in effect, compulsory negotiation, the parties sitting down to try to reach a settlement, or voluntary arbitration which is, in effect, a giving to a third party to make the decision?

Mr. ROGERS. As I understand voluntary arbitration, and I may misunderstand it, each side voluntarily agrees to submit the issues they themselves cannot agree upon to a third party. That third party is picked by letting each side pick a member of a panel of three, with the third person either picked by the agreement of the parties or by the President of the United States, or by the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. ADAMS. In other words, what you have, though, is a difference between bargaining and having a third-party settlement. That is what I am trying to get at. That is what the President has suggested: that if they can't agree, a third party will settle it.

Mr. ROGERS. But this is voluntary and not by law. I hope the gentleman distinguishes that. There is the fact that this is presently used to settle many of the problems under the present procedures now used by the two parties for different disagreements. I am sure the gentleman realizes that.

Mr. ADAMS. Correct. It has been, as I understand it, offered and rejected in February of this year in this matter.

Mr. ROGERS. But now one party says they will agree. Why won't the other party agree to voluntary arbitration, if they want to keep col-