

In that connection, as I understood it from both parties, bargaining has failed up to this point. Is that your understanding, Mr. Wolfe?

Mr. WOLFE. Yes, sir; and I believe—

Mr. WATSON. In this dispute, bargaining has failed up to this point.

Mr. WOLFE. Yes, sir; it has with these particular unions.

Mr. WATSON. And you have never tried voluntary arbitration as outlined in the Railway Labor Act?

Mr. WOLFE. Not in this case.

Mr. WATSON. That is a procedure established by law. You have been willing to resort to that procedure, as I understand it, but the other side was unwilling to do so.

Mr. WOLFE. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. WATSON. I understand from the testimony of Mr. Greenough, and you have corroborated that, even at this late hour you are willing to follow the procedures outlined in section 7 of the Railway Labor Act, and that is to submit the remaining issues in dispute to final arbitration?

Mr. WOLFE. We agree to do that.

Mr. WATSON. In addition to your willingness to submit the issues to voluntary arbitration are you also willing to apply the procedures as outlined in section 7 of the Railway Labor Act so far as it relates to the appointment of this arbitration committee?

Mr. WOLFE. Yes, sir; we are.

Mr. WATSON. Do you prefer the three- or the six-member Board?

Mr. WOLFE. We have no preference. We would accept the wishes of the unions in that respect. If they want a board of three men, one from each of the parties and a neutral to be selected in conformity with the act, we will go for that.

Mr. WATSON. So as of this point, you are willing to follow the procedures as presently outlined in the Railway Labor Act to try to finally settle this issue in accordance with present law and in accordance with established procedure under the Railway Labor Act?

Mr. WOLFE. I bind the railroads now.

Mr. WATSON. I will forgo any further questions, hoping that the other side would agree to this.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Pickle.

Mr. PICKLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Greenough, I notice on page 4 of your statement you discuss the three alternatives, but you think House Joint Resolution 559 would be the most reasonable of the three alternatives. You also state, "Preferably, I think this should be provided for on a permanent basis so as to avoid laying these problems on the doorstep of Congress repeatedly."

I agree with you generally speaking, that I think we need improvement in our present procedures. That is one reason why I had earlier this year introduced a bill, H.R. 5638, with respect to permanent improvements in the overall act.

I don't ask your position on that, except I assume, generally speaking, from the statement with your appearance today, you are in favor of some such general approach.