

Again, David Ginsburg, an attorney in the District of Columbia whose service to this Government and to this country goes back and includes experience as General Counsel of the OPA during that difficult war period, his advice to Presidents, to congressional committees, his service to the country and particularly in this case his chairmanship of the Emergency Board No. 169 set up under the National Railway Act.

I don't mean to overmake the point, Mr. Chairman. Here are five men, including myself, who worked very hard with this case and who, beyond that, testify here from the deepest conviction possible in the validity and fundamental importance of the concept of free, collective bargaining.

It is from that standpoint that we speak, and with that conviction that we will respond to the questions of the committee.

I have filed with the committee, Mr. Chairman, a statement of moderate length which, if it meets with your convenience and pleasure, I will simply ask to be made part of the record and which I will summarize very briefly because this is a matter comparatively well known to the country and to the committee. My going into it in detail at this point will probably only burden the record.

I will be guided by your judgment as to whether you would prefer to have it read or briefly summarized.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe the committee would prefer that you do file it for the record and give us the pertinent points so that the committee will know, even if it is a burden to those who think they know. I think it should be brought out for the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF W. WILLARD WIRTZ, SECRETARY OF LABOR

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee: I testify, on behalf of the Administration, in support of H.J. Res. 559.

This testimony will be brief, perhaps even to the point of seeming out of proportion to the significance of the subject.

The members of the Committee have been supplied, however, with a complete record of the events leading up to the introduction of H.J. Res. 559, including all the relevant documents. The President's May 4 Message to the Congress proposing this Joint Resolution, sets out fully the reasons for it.

The remaining function is largely to summarize what is involved here, as a basis for the questions I know the Committee will have.

I

First, as to the nature and history of the dispute which remains unresolved: The dispute involves virtually all of the Nation's railroad carriers and the railroad shopcraft employees represented by six unions, briefly referred to as the Machinists, the Boilermakers, the Sheet Metal Workers, the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the Railway Carmen, and the Firemen and Oilers, bargaining through the Railway Employees Department, AFL-CIO.

The dispute developed as part of the "1967 round" of wage reopenings on the railroads. All railroads and all 20 or so organizations representing railroad employees were involved. The parties first sought settlement of their differences through private collective bargaining, at the local level and later at the national level. This was during the summer and fall of 1966.

Subsequently the National Mediation Board worked with the parties, attempting to arrive at settlements which would be acceptable to all concerned.

The main issue was a general wage increase—with various additional issues in each case.

Agreements were reached between the carriers and eleven labor organizations representing about three-quarters of all railroad employees.