

more and more to the tactic of forcing seizure in major disputes? Certainly at the very least the functions of Presidents' Emergency Board provided for by the present law would become merely futile exercises. The unions would be rewarded for rejecting their recommendations.

Even when labor unions advocate government seizure, there is evidence of serious reservations on the part of responsible union leaders. For example, the April 18 issue of the Daily Labor Report of Bureau of National Affairs stated:

"C. L. Dennis, president of the Railway Clerks, AFL-CIO's largest transportation union, says at a press briefing in Washington that compulsory settlement of nationwide contract disputes may not be far down the road. The immediate prospects, according to Dennis, is for 'a one shot law' to settle the current dispute between the railroads and the six shopcraft unions."

The shop unions themselves have suggested that if the parties cannot agree, arbitration is the way to provide an ultimate solution, as follows:

"In their efforts to reach agreement on the ultimate goal of such a wage rationalization, the parties can invoke the good offices of the Department of Labor and other Federal agencies to furnish occupational and labor market information needed in their determination of occupational and job comparability. If in the final analysis they cannot agree on the ultimate degree of comparability, they should then have recourse to arbitration of the unresolved issues." (Page 35, Shop Union Brief filed with Emergency Board 169, February 1967.)

Arbitration assures a prompt disposition (instead of postponement) of the dispute—a disposition that is not dictated by unreasonable demands of one side or the other, but is responsive to the merits of the case. A party seeking justice need not fear an impartial adjudication where all other avenues of settlement have failed.

Certainly arbitration—a prompt and fair decision—is far preferable to seizure, which postpones the day of reckoning and opens Pandora's Box of unmeasurable consequences for the whole nation.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 28, 1967]

ARBITRATION IS THE FAIR WAY TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC FROM A PARALYZING RAILROAD STRIKE

The fair—the only—way to save this nation from a paralyzing railroad strike in the next few days is for Congress to require both the unions and the railroads to submit the dispute to binding arbitration.

Unless Congress acts to prevent it, a group of shopcraft unions led by the International Association of Machinists, will bring the nation's rail transportation system to a grinding halt at 12:01 a.m., on May 3. The International Association of Machinists is the same union that shut down a large segment of the nation's airlines for more than 40 days last summer.

The railroads have consistently said they are willing to leave the decision in this dispute to an impartial third party. But the unions have steadfastly refused. Why?

The railroads believe anyone seeking justice need not fear an impartial decision by a third party when all other avenues of settlement have failed.

The public overwhelmingly favors arbitration over a rail strike. A recent national poll of public opinion (February) showed the public almost 2 to 1 in favor of arbitration over a strike in transportation (57% for, 29% against 14% no opinion).

Unlike government seizure of the railroads which may keep the railroads operating but really does nothing to settle the issues, arbitration does clear up the issues, bring final settlement and protect the public interest.

In view of the basic fairness of an impartial third party decision when two sides fail to agree; in view of the public support for the principle of arbitration in transportation, and in view of the disastrous consequences of a nation-wide rail strike, Congress can serve the public interest best by promptly enacting legislation requiring an arbitrated settlement of the issues in this dispute.