

of the areas of disagreement which has been accomplished in bargaining and mediation."

But it developed that the issues before that "arbitration board" were of such a nature—involving basic manning principles—that the Board found it necessary to establish its own framework of decision.

H.J. Res. 559 has been designed specifically to counteract the effects of P.L. 88-108 and to require that the answers in the present dispute be taken from the settlement course the *parties* have laid out—and come so near to completing.

Any sense of the practicalities of the kind of debate H.J. Res. 559 will be properly subject to means full realization of the inevitability of its being identified in whatever manner best serves the argument being made. I make only the point that it has been drawn from a conviction that "compulsory arbitration" and "seizure" are *wrong*; that it is not either of these; and that it represents the fullest possible degree of preserving the force of collective bargaining in this situation and the smallest possible degree of interference with that force. If there are means of serving that purpose more fully, provision for them in this Resolution would be clearly within its intention.

There are present with me here: Under Secretary of Labor, James J. Reynolds; Francis A. O'Neill, Jr., Chairman of the National Mediation Board; David Ginsburg, Chairman of the Emergency Board which acted in this case under the Railway Labor Act; Judge Charles Fahy, Chairman of the Special Mediation Panel.

These men, with their associates, have labored long and diligently and with the strength of lifetimes of experience, to make collective bargaining work in this case. They are in a position to tell you how far collective bargaining has already made its force felt here so that it will, under H.J. Res. 559, be the architect of the final settlement.

All five of us, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, believe deeply in the value to democracy of free collective bargaining. It is in that belief that we support this Resolution, and will answer your questions about it.

Secretary WIRTZ. I wish to also call the committee's attention to a notebook which has been placed before each member in which we have set out the full record of this case, including all of the relevant documents, so that you will have all of that before you.

Proceeding on that basis of understanding, Mr. Chairman, I will mention only these things:

We know, all of us, that the dispute involves all of the railroads, and they are the class I railroads in the country and the six shopcraft unions which represent organizations which represent about 137,000 of the railroad employees.

We know the history of their dispute, which stretches over a good part of a year, which includes active private, collective bargaining, very active mediation on the part of the National Mediation Board, the services then—under the National Railway Act—of Emergency Board No. 169, which made recommendations to the parties, and then, after the first extension by the Congress of the status quo period, the services of the special mediation panel.

We know, and it is very pertinent to the history of House Joint Resolution 559, that on April 21 the mediation panel under Judge Fahy's chairmanship and with the other members being Dr. George W. Taylor and Dr. John T. Dunlop, made a recommendation to the parties which is referred to hereafter as the recommendation of April 21.

Against that too brief background or brief summary of the background, I say only this about House Joint Resolution 559: It has been suggested that it is a complicated procedure. Gentlemen, it is, because it reflects every effort to exhaust every possibility of settlement along the lines that you, Mr. Chairman, have referred to in your opening statement, because we share the conviction that there