

I appear before you to voice the railway labor movement's determined opposition to House Joint Resolution 559 and to any other measure that would fasten a regime of forced labor—whether you call it finality or compulsory arbitration, or whatever—on the private employees of privately owned corporations.

Who profits by this bill, if enacted? The Nation's railroad corporations profit, whose earnings will be increased by paying lower wages than their shopcraft employees could win by exerting their own economic strength.

Who loses by this bill, if enacted? The underpaid railroad shopmen lose, by losing their democratic right to strike and the wages it could bring them.

This bill rewards the corporations and punishes the workingman. We find that grossly unfair. Moreover, the compulsory arbitration in this bill, coming on top of the compulsory arbitration Congress enacted in 1963, threatens to kill whatever life now remains in national collective bargaining in the railroad industry. Lastly, House Joint Resolution 559 is not only a biased bill; we believe it is also an unnecessary bill.

I should like to raise with you four principal questions:

First, if the railroad shopmen strike, need it be a national emergency?

Second, isn't there a better legislative approach than compulsory arbitration?

Third, who supports and who opposes antistrike legislation like House Joint Resolution 559?

Fourth, what is the broad background of labor-management relations in the railroad industry, against which one should judge the impact of restrictive legislation?

My first question is perhaps the most important of all. Every one of us is aware that nearly 500,000 young Americans are now fighting in the jungles and mountains of Vietnam. Many of them are the sons of railroaders. Not a single person in the railway labor movement wants to injure these, our sons, so far away.

With that in mind, Mr. Michael Fox, on behalf of the railroad shopcraft unions, and I, on behalf of the RLEA, sent a telegram to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, on April 28, 1967, reading as follows:

In view of scheduled national strike by railroad shopcraft unions at 12:01 a.m., May 3, we stand ready to meet with you at any time to arrange for continued rail transport of all shipments necessary to our Nation's military effort and the public health. This offer is made on behalf of shopcraft unions and other railroad unions. Cooperation on part of railroad managements would also be needed.

On May 2 we received a reply from one of Mr. McNamara's associates, Mr. V. F. Caputo, Director for Transportation and Warehousing Policy in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense. He wrote:

This is to convey our appreciation for the assurance given in your message of April 28, 1967, to the Secretary of Defense, regarding shipments of materiel required to support our Nation's military effort.

In view of the fact that the deadline for the scheduled national strike by railroad shopcraft unions has been extended to June 19, 1967, it would appear that a meeting as you proposed is not now necessary. We will continue, however, to