of February. I would have to review my notes, but I am quite certain

I am not far off as to the time.

Mr. Van Deerlin. Mr. Greenough's statement this morning that the carriers would be willing to enter into voluntary arbitration does not represent the first statement by management that this would be a

satisfactory solution from management's standpoint?

Mr. Wolfe. That is not the first statement to that effect. We have never refused to submit any dispute to arbitration because we believe in the final analysis arbitration is a very important step in collective bargaining procedures, and it is the right way to compose such difficulties in the American way and with fairness and equitable results to both parties.

By the way, Mr. Congressman, it was January 6, 1967.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Thank you.

Mr. Adams. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Yes.

Mr. Adams. Mr. Wolfe, we come back to the same point we did when you testified. It has always been the position of the carriers, has it not, that in railway disputes they should be arbitrated rather than bargained to the final conclusion?

Mr. Wolfe. No; it has not been. The industry policy in regard to

arbitration is of comparatively recent origin.

Mr. Adams. Then I will strike the word "always" and state that it is the position of management, represented by yourself and the other gentleman, and I will inquire further in just a moment, that arbitration is the way that management would like to have this settled?

Mr. Wolfe. Let me answer that this way, if I may, Mr. Adams: So far as the railroad industry is concerned, we have compulsory arbitra-

Mr. Adams. In a major portion or a large portion of the disputes this is correct.

Mr. Wolfe. No; in all disputes.

Mr. Adams. In disputes under your contracts. We understand that.

But not in this area. You would like to extend it to this area.

Mr. Wolfe. No. So far as the railroads are concerned, we have it in this area because an emergency board recommendation, so far as management is concerned, is tantamount to final and binding arbitration.

You would not permit us, the executive branch of our Government would not permit us, to refuse to accept an Emergency Board report,

and I have had that experience.

Mr. Adams. All right. Now, Mr. Greenough, on page 3 you state that in addition, seizure is one sided in that all pressures are brought to bear against management. Railroads are deprived of control of their properties and the only way they can get back control is by reaching a settlement, which would merely tend to make the position of the unions more adamant.

Employees, on the other hand, would probably not lose anything except the immediate availability of the increase in their wages because

of the practice of making settlements retroactive.

Is it not true, Mr. Greenough, that what we do is take away the only economic weapon that the employees have, which is to strike?

Mr. Greenough. They haven't taken away any economic weapon.