

trial disputes as to all industrial matters shall be arbitrated, and then it goes on in the law to define industrial matters as all matters pertaining to the relations of employers and employees, reading from the statute, "Without limiting the generalities of the foregoing, it includes," as I set out in my statement, the lists of inclusions, "all matters or things affecting or relating to work done or to be done; the privileges, rights and duties of employees and employers." And then every single thing the mind could devise as possibly coming up in the course of collective bargaining, all brought within the jurisdiction and responsibility of the arbitrators.

And then completing a long list, including finally, even, the provision of first aid equipment, medical attendance, ambulance facilities, restroom, sanitary, washing facilities, canteens, cafeterias, dining rooms, and other amenities for employees. And as though that wasn't enough, the law in Australia goes on to provide that it also includes all matters of what is right and fair in relation to an industrial matter having regard to the interests of the persons immediately concerned and the society as a whole.

That, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, is compulsory arbitration. It is exactly what this resolution is designed to prevent happening in this country.

Then one other comparison. Public Law 88-108 was adopted to meet the railroad strike or crisis in 1963. That turned out to be compulsory arbitration. There was an effort, and an honest effort made, to prevent that happening, because the Congress wrote into that law that the decision of the arbitration board shall incorporate in its decision any matters on which it finds the parties were in agreement, shall resolve the matters on which the parties were not in agreement and shall, in making its award, give due consideration to those matters on which the parties were in tentative agreement, and to the narrowing of the areas of disagreement which had been accomplished in bargaining and mediation.

But we all know that it developed that the issues before that arbitration board, as it was called in that statute, were of such a nature—involving basic principles—that that board found it necessary to establish its own framework of decision.

House Joint Resolution 559 has been designed specifically to counteract the effects of Public Law 88-108 and to require that the answers in the present dispute be taken from the settlement course the parties have laid out and have come so near to getting.

I don't mean to press the point of terminology too far. In any sense, the practicalities in a situation of this kind, or any experience with the debate which properly accompanies a consideration of something like House Joint Resolution 559, makes you know that the argument about it will be cast in whatever terms best support the argument.

I just make this point: This resolution has been drawn from the deep conviction of a President and his advisers, the deep conviction that compulsory arbitration and seizure are wrong. It is neither of these two things. It represents simply the fullest possible degree of preserving the force of collective bargaining in this situation and the smallest possible degree of interference with that force.