

Chicago Daily News (April 28, 1967) : When Congress imposed a settlement on the railroad firemen, the public was well served by the decision to jettison ludicrous union demands. The same concern for the public good should prevail now.

Washington Star (April 28, 1967) : As we have pointed out in the past, laws compelling a settlement have successfully been used in several other countries including Australia, New Zealand, Germany and Sweden. It's time for Congress to get to work on such a basic new law.

Los Angeles Times (April 27, 1967) : An ideal solution would be agreement by both sides to submit to binding arbitration if an impasse is reached. . . . Congress compelled arbitration in the threatened nationwide rail strike in 1963 when a work rules dispute resisted all mediation attempts. That action must again be taken if the rail shopcraft unions refuse to call off their strike.

N.Y. World Journal Tribune (April 13, 1967) : Certainly there is a strong case to be made for (Congress) obviating strikes that motivate national calamities. . . . Does this add up to a case for systematic compulsory arbitration? It may, indeed, in the absence of workable alternatives.

St. Louis Globe Democrat (April 13, 1967) : We badly need a law to bar national strikes which erode public interests and slug the public. Such a law should propose compulsory arbitration and a special court for management-labor issues.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch (April 12, 1967) : Congress knew or should have known in 1963 that compulsory arbitration, permanent and covering all the railroad unions, was the only remaining recourse to bring reasoning into these disputes.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (April 12, 1967) : The only way to end the almost continual labor contract crisis in the nation's transportation facilities covered by the Railway Labor Act appears to be to put teeth in the recommendation of presidential emergency boards . . . to make binding a board's findings could be the only answer.

Christian Science Monitor (April 10, 1967) : We recommend that the possibility of including compulsory arbitration in any strike legislation be given serious consideration.

ATTACHMENT B

ORC CARAVAN SURVEYS, FEBRUARY 1967

"Here's a suggested plan to do away with strikes in transportation industries. Companies and unions would try to settle each labor dispute by bargaining. If they could not settle the dispute, the President of the United States would appoint an impartial arbitration board and whatever the board decided would be final and binding on both sides. Would you be for or against a compulsory arbitration law like this?"

	Total U.S. public
Number of interviews-----	2,023
For (percent) -----	57
Against (percent) -----	29
No opinion (percent)-----	14

Mr. ADAMS. Referring to the first paragraph, Mr. Secretary, and then referring to the first paragraph in the memorandum, would it be your statement that that gentleman, Mr. Wolfe, has indicated that compulsory arbitration is at least an acceptable position to the industry?

Secretary WIRTZ. Yes, I think that is right, although that would be subject to his own comment, of course.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes. I want to put this in context.

In 559, you have suggested that there be this freezing. I want to know what your position would be on requiring the parties in a 90-day period to have the management make a public offer, have it voted on by the unions, and, if rejected, a counter public offer sent back to management with either a public acceptance or rejection of it. Remember, we are talking about only national emergency strikes.