

When we informed the management side that we considered the 6 percent for 18 months inadequate as a general wage increase, they abruptly broke off the talks and they have not renewed them since.

That is the record. Over this whole period of nearly a year, I do not believe the railroads have negotiated with us in good faith. They have wanted to settle on their own terms or not at all. They have tried to provoke a national strike call, hoping that you in Congress would pass a law depriving all railroad workers forever of their right to strike.

I should like now, if I may, to answer some of the carrier propaganda you have been hearing and at the same time explain why the Fahy mediation panel's proposals are not as favorable as they may seem on the surface.

First, the railroads claim that political pressures force them to accept settlements beyond those recommended by emergency boards. But in the present dispute the proposal made by the President's Mediation Panel is, in fact, no escalation at all of the Emergency Board's recommendations.

It may appear to be so on the surface, but it is not. I quote the Mediation Panel's report to the President on April 22: "The Panel believes that this proposed settlement is not inconsistent with the Emergency Board report. . . ." I think that you and we and everyone else can take the word of these three mediators—Judge Fahy and Professors Taylor and Dunlop—that their recommendations, though phrased differently, are in line with what the earlier Emergency Board had in mind.

Now, gentlemen, the railroads said they accepted the Emergency Board recommendations—but then later they rejected the Mediation Panel's recommendations, despite the similarities. Do you call that good faith collective bargaining?

Of course, there was one very significant difference between these two sets of recommendations.

The Emergency Board wanted a "job evaluation study" set up in a way so that the railroads could get some of the pay rates cut. The President's Mediation Panel threw that out.

As Judge Fahy told the Senate Labor Committee:

. . . the 15 cents which we suggest as a substantial beginning (on closing the skilled shopmen's pay inequity) does not cause the carriers to run any serious risk of having to overpay anyone.

But the carrier negotiators keep insisting on a joint job study that might cut some of the pay rates. Clearly we could never agree to that, as our members deserve and expect a substantial pay increase, not a reduction in their rates. Do you think it is good faith bargaining for the railroads to demand that of us, at this late date?

The railroads have not seriously been trying to settle this dispute. They have been trying to goad us into setting a strike date, and then goad you into passing a law taking away our right to strike.

A significant report on this appeared in the Wall Street Journal for April 6, 1967, as follows:

Railroad sources in Chicago said carrier officials met yesterday with their lobbyists to form strategy. Their current plan involves introduction of a "finality" bill to abolish strikes under the Railway Labor Act, which covers airlines as well as railroads.