

more than a month has gone by since the bill was submitted on May 4, and that rail legislation was a matter of urgent concern."  
(The dispatch referred to by Congressman Brown follows:)

[UPI Bulletin 65]

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 6, 1967.

President Johnson told Democratic congressional leaders today that enactment of legislation to prevent a nationwide rail strike remains "a matter of urgent concern" and the White House said they promised to push for its enactment.

Press Secretary George Christian said Johnson told the group the Nation "literally cannot afford a rail strike" when existing legislation runs out on June 19.

Christian said Johnson hailed a Senate labor subcommittee's approval of the long-run measure yesterday but "pointed out that more than a month has gone by since the bill was submitted on May 4 and that rail legislation was a matter of urgent concern."

"The President referred to his statement of May 4 in which he said that a nationwide rail strike would result in intolerable injury to the country," Christian said. "He said that literally, the Nation cannot afford a rail strike."

Christian said that during Johnson's breakfast meeting with the leaders at the White House, Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield "indicated every effort would be made to have early action" by the full Senate Labor Committee. And Christian said House leaders told Johnson they intend to push as hard as they can.

Noting that the deadline is 12:01 a.m., June 19, Christian said: "I would describe it as an urgent situation. Actually, the 18th is that last full day of grace. So that leaves only 12 days."

Mr. BROWN. Frankly, it is a matter of concern to me that the President would try to make this point, that the Congress has not acted with some dispatch and concern in this matter when, according to what you have just said, there has been no real push on the part of the White House or the Department of Labor to get the two parties together for discussions or to get a question asked, as we have had asked here this morning, whether the two parties will voluntarily submit to arbitration.

I would like, if I can, to pick up one other question.

It seems to me, Mr. Greenough, that you have a dichotomy in your testimony. On page 5 of that testimony, you say:

A binding determination by a neutral board can be just as distasteful in results for railroad management as for railroad unions—

A position with which I thoroughly agree. I believe it could be distasteful on both sides.

But on page 4 you say:

A binding determination by a neutral board appointed by the President of the United States, after collective bargaining has failed to achieve a settlement, should be provided for on a permanent basis so as to avoid laying these problems on the doorstep of Congress repeatedly.

My question is: Is it the position of the rail management or your position as the individual president of the Pennsylvania Railroad that we should have compulsory arbitration as a matter of course in the rail industry?

Mr. GREENOUGH. We must have some sort of finality, Mr. Brown, in my opinion, if we are to avoid these recurring emergency situations. Whether it is a labor court or whether it is arbitration, I am not pre-