might show different results. But I believe Mr. Harris' poll is an honest effort to get at the public's true feelings.

I find it significant also that the right to strike is supported by a very wide segment of the big business community. In March 1964 the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, after 2 years of work on the subject, published a report entitled "Union Powers and Union Functions." This CED Research and Policy Committee, composed of 50 members, was headed then by Mr. Theodore Yntema, chairman, finance committee, Ford Motor Co., with Mr. Emilio Collado, vice president, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, serving as vice chairman.

Members included such men as Mr. John T. Connor, Mr. Marion B. Folsom, Mr. Frederick R. Kappel, Mr. Ralph Lazarus, Mr. J. M. Symes of the Pennsylvania Railroad—men of that stature in the big business world.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that a list of members of the CED committee who drew up that 1964 report be printed in the record after my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that may be done.

(See p. 233.)

Mr. LEIGHTY. Now, there is much in that 1964 big business report that I disagree with heartily, nor do I agree completely with their conclusions about "Government Intervention in Collective Bargaining." But I do find the general tenor of their conclusions on the subject highly significant, and I should like to read you a few paragraphs on this from their report:

> There is little evidence that industrial peace is achieved through increased government intervention. While government intervention may end particular strikes, the prospect of intervention may increase the number of disputes carried to the point where intervention becomes necessary. The number of strikes increased during World War II (1942–45) despite the quasi-compulsory arbitration provided by the War Labor Board. Experience with emergency boards under the Railway Labor Act provisions also suggests that fact-finding boards with power to recommend settlements do not lead to voluntary agreements. The government has seized the railroads and enforced acceptance of emergency boards' recommended terms of settlement when the railway brotherhoods have refused to accept the terms of the recommended settlement. In their effect on employers, recommendations were tantamount to compulsory arbitration. (This particular statement, I may say, I find inaccurate.) Free collective bargaining disintegrated in both cases to the point where Congress has now legislated overt compulsory arbitration in the railroad "work rules" case.
>
> The reason for the failure of government intervention to produce industrial peace is fairly clear. Compulsory settlement is destructive of collective bargaining because it removes the responsibility from the parties. Compulsory procedures establish an "adversary" attitude that minimizes the desire of either party to compromise . . . . Free collective bargaining falls into disuse under such a system.
>
> A further result is that government-influenced or government-dictated agreements may affect the entire economy, placing federal authorities in the role of controlling wages, prices and working conditions.
>
> *The proper role of government in labor-management relations and collective bargaining is to establish the rules of the game and see that they are observed —not to decide what the final score should be.* (Emphasis in the original.)
>
> We emphasize that the possibility and fact of strikes must exist if there is to be free collective bargaining, and we urge that government intervention in strikes should be strictly limited. However, strikes are not to be welcomed, and efforts *by the parties* to resolve their differences without work stoppages are important.

That was the conclusion reached by this group of big businessmen after 2 years of studying the subject. By contrast I should like to