

The brief of the union goes on:

The precise extent of the gap admittedly is in dispute because of differences between the parties over skill comparison and cannot be determined with competence by this or any other Emergency Board. Only the parties can determine this, and then only after objective inquiry and intense negotiations. The ultimate objective should be to agree on a set of rates for railroad shop mechanics consistent in terms of their skill, their worth and their responsibilities with rates in the same occupations in comparable employment outside the railroad industry.

I want to read what I consider to be the most important aspect of this dispute. I wish you now to consider it, and I ask that with the greatest respect in light of what has been said to you and in the light of this record. I also urge that you keep in mind that the only semblance of due process in this case was before Emergency Board No. 169.

There the parties were permitted to present witnesses, exhibits, to argue their case, and they were given all the rights, moral and constitutional, encompassed in the phrase "due process."

Here is what the unions said, and again I quote:

In their efforts to reach agreement on the ultimate goal of such 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.

However, uncertainties to the extent of future adjustments that will ultimately be justified by occupational or wage comparisons obviously does not preclude and should not stand in the way of an immediate and significant beginning.

The first mention of the word arbitration is on the part of the union.

They were bitterly critical of the Ginsburg Report but it contained exactly what the unions urged this Emergency Board to recommend. And then they rejected the report in its entirety.

I want to read, if I may, a few things that the Emergency Board had to say about the wage adjustments they had recommended:

During the 3-year period from December 1963 through December 1966, the average straight time hourly earnings of the shop craft employees increased from \$2.62 per hour to \$2.97 per hour, with an average annual increase of 3.4 percent. During that period the average straight time hourly earnings of production workers in durable goods increased from \$2.59 to \$2.81 an hour, with an annual increase of 2.8 percent. To us, this record means that the real earnings of the shopcraft employees have increased during this period at a rate greater than that for workers generally in the economy.

The recommendations of this Board were made on the record that was submitted to the Board by the parties, and it was a most comprehensive record. This Board did not reach up in the air and get an amount simply in an effort to impose a settlement on one or the other of the parties.

They did support it, and they supported it by the record that was made by the parties.

For their reward for their diligence and conscientious effort to help the parties do something that they were obviously not big enough to do themselves—because we did fail—they were bitterly criticized by the unions.

Nevertheless, this Board did give us a recommendation that should have been acceptable, that should and would have corrected any inequity in our industry, regardless of what those inequities may have been. They recommended that this be done in the same manner that the unions urged it be done.