

In the end, the unions involved will get free of those injunctions, and then the manning question will either be settled through collective bargaining or Congress will face a new "crisis."

Altogether, up to now, compulsory arbitration has been a resounding failure in this industry. I believe Mr. H. E. Gilbert and Mr. Charles Luna will have more to tell you about that 1963 law, of great relevance to your consideration of House Joint Resolution 559.

Equally vital is the fact that an evenhanded seizure tends to promote a negotiated settlement of the labor dispute involved, while compulsory arbitration—despite all the trimmings that have been added to House Joint Resolution 559—does not promote a negotiated settlement, because it gives the railroad corporations no incentive whatever to budge from their present position.

In the last four Government seizures of the railroads, in 1943, 1946, 1948, and 1950, there were quite prompt negotiated settlements in three of the cases, even though those seizures were not evenhanded but were stacked in favor of the railroad corporations. Here is what happened:

In 1943 the railroads were seized on December 27, the dispute was settled by the parties by January 17, 1944, and the railroads were returned to their owners on January 18, 1944.

In 1946 the railroads were seized on May 17, the dispute was settled by the parties on May 25 (though only after President Truman had threatened to draft the strikers), and the railroads were returned to their owners on May 26.

In 1948, the railroads were seized on May 10, the dispute was settled by the parties on July 8, and the railroads were returned to their owners on July 9.

The Korean war seizure, on August 27, 1950, lasted very much longer—nearly 21 months. There were several reasons for that: An outrageously unfair Emergency Board recommendation, the wage controls in force at the time and, perhaps most important, the completely token nature of the seizure, including the assurance that the railroad corporations would collect all the profits.

In view of this record I find it astonishing that the railroads in their current propaganda claim that "seizure settles nothing." History shows that even a stacked, one-sided seizure has a good chance of promoting an early negotiated settlement—whereas the 1963 compulsory arbitration law truly did settle nothing. An evenhanded seizure law might well bring a negotiated settlement of this current dispute even before the law took effect.

I come now to my third topic: Who supports and who opposes the right to strike? I believe it is clear that the settled public opinion of the Nation—especially when opinion is not whipped up temporarily by the propagandists of crisis—does support the right to strike.

The Louis Harris organization found some significant answers to this question in a public opinion poll published in the Washington Post on March 28, 1967.

Mr. Harris, among other things, asked specifically how many people approved the right to strike for railroaders. He found that 69 percent of the general public and 89 percent of the Nation's union members voiced approval of this right for railroad employees.

Now I am aware that a poll could be made, financed, say, by the railroads and with questions supplied by their propagandists, which