**The original documents are located in Box D32, folder "West Michigan Chapter of Delta Nu Alpha Transportation Fraternity, Grand Rapids, MI, April 10, 1972" of the Ford Congressional Papers: Press Secretary and Speech File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.**

WEST MICHIGAN CHAPTER OF DELTA NU ALPHA TRANSPORTATION FRATERNITY, GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN, 7 P.M. APRIL 10, 1972.

GENTLEMEN, IT'S A GREAT PLEASURE TO BE HERE. IT IS AN INTERESTING EXPERIENCE FOR ME TO BE TALKING TO A TRANSPORTATION FRATERNITY. SPEAKING OF TRANSPORTATION, DID YOU EVER GET THE FEELING THAT YOU'RE GOING NOWHERE -- AND HAVE ALREADY ARRIVED?

THAT, OF COURSE, IS THE KIND OF FEELING WE ALL GET AS INCOME TAX DAY APPROACHES. APRIL 17 IS INCOME TAX DAY. THAT'S WHEN YOU'RE HAUNTED BY THE GHOST OF EARNINGS PAST.

YOU REMEMBER THE INCOME TAX. IT'S LIKE A DO-IT-YOURSELF MUGGING.

YOU SHOULD SEE THE TAX FORMS THEY USE IN LAS VEGAS.

THEY HAVE THREE BOXES YOU CAN CHECK. REFUND, APPLY TO NEXT YEAR'S TAXES, AND DOUBLE OR NOTHING.

I ALWAYS GET AN ACCOUNTANT TO DO MY TAXES. THROUGH THE YEARS I HAVE FOUND THAT A FORM 1040 IS EASIER READ THAN DONE.

MY ACCOUNTANT ALWAYS PUTS AN X WHERE I'M SUPPOSED TO SIGN. I THINK IT STANDS FOR THE LANGUAGE I USE WHEN I SIGN IT.

I HAVE A WONDERFUL ACCOUNTANT. WHAT HE DOESN'T KNOW ABOUT INCOME TAXES WOULD FILL A JAIL CELL.

I KNEW I WAS IN TROUBLE WHEN HE HAD TO LOOK UP THE INSTRUCTIONS TO FILL IN ONE SPACE. WHERE IT SAID DATE:.

INCOME TAX TIME BRINGS US THE MISERIES. BUT I CAN TELL YOU ONE THING.

LEISURE TIME IS NO LONGER A PROBLEM FOR ANY OF US. THANKS TO MODERN METHODS OF TRANSPORTATION, WE USE IT ALL UP GETTING TO AND FROM WORK.

BUT, SERIOUSLY, WE DO HAVE TREMENDOUS PROBLEMS IN TRANSPORTATION TODAY, AND THESE PROBLEMS HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH GETTING TO WORK. THEY HAVE TO DO WITH KEEPING THE TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY WORKING, KEEPING IT FROM SHUTTING DOWN.

AS YOU KNOW, THE PRESIDENT RECENTLY INVOKED THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT TO DELAY A THREATENED RAIL STRIKE FOR 60 DAYS -- UNTIL MIDNIGHT MAY 31.

IT WAS ALSO NOT LONG AGO THAT THE LONGEST DOCK STRIKE IN THE HISTORY OF THE COUNTRY -- THE WEST COAST WORK STOPPAGE -- FINALLY ENDED. THE DOCK WORKERS WENT BACK TO THEIR JOBS ONLY AFTER

THREE-QUARTERS OF A BILLION DOLLARS IN AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS WERE LOST, AND ONLY AFTER CONGRESS HAD ADOPTED EMERGENCY LEGISLATION TO MAKE SURE THAT OUR WEST COAST PORTS WOULD BEGIN OPERATING AGAIN.

WHAT THIS DRAMATIZES IS THE FACT THAT LABOR DISPUTES IN THE TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY ARE BRINGING CRISIS AFTER CRISIS TO OUR NATION. AND THESE CRISES ARE REPEATEDLY WINDING UP IN CONGRESS' LAP.

NINE TIMES IN THE LAST NINE YEARS CONGRESS HAS HAD TO ENACT SPECIAL LEGISLATION TO RESTORE THE FLOW OF COMMERCE.

THERE WAS THE 1963 RAILROAD OPERATING EMPLOYES MANNING DISPUTE, WHEN CONGRESS CREATED A BOARD OF ARBITRATION TO RENDER A BINDING AWARD DISPOSING OF

FIREMAN MANNING AND CREW CONSIST ISSUES.

THERE WAS THE 1966-67 RAILROAD SHOPCRAFT EMPLOYES WAGE DISPUTE WHEN CONGRESS ON APRIL 12, 1967, PROVIDED FOR A 20-DAY EXTENSION OF THE PERIOD OF STATUTORY RESTRAINT . . . AND ON MAY 2, 1967, PROVIDED FOR A 47-DAY EXTENSION . . . AND ON JULY 17, 1967, ESTABLISHED A SPECIAL BOARD TO MEDIATE THE DISPUTE AND, FAILING SETTLEMENT OF THE DISPUTE THROUGH MEDIATION, ISSUED A DETERMINATION IMPLEMENTING EMERGENCY BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS.

THERE WAS THE 1969-70 SHOPCRAFT EMPLOYES WAGE DISPUTE WHEN CONGRESS ON MARCH 4, 1970, PROVIDED FOR A 37-DAY EXTENSION OF A COOLING OFF PERIOD AND ON APRIL 9, 1970, IMPLEMENTED THE PARTIES' "MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING" WHICH

MEMBERS OF ONE OF THE FOUR UNIONS INVOLVED HAD FAILED TO RATIFY.

THERE WAS THE 1970-71 RAILROAD WORK-WAGE RULES DISPUTE WHEN CONGRESS PROVIDED FOR AN 81-DAY EXTENSION OF THE PERIOD OF STATUTORY RESTRAINT AND ALSO IMPLEMENTED THE FIRST-YEAR WAGE INCREASES RECOMMENDED BY AN EMERGENCY BOARD.

THERE WAS THE 1971 RAILROAD SIGNALMEN'S DISPUTE WHEN CONGRESS ON MAY 18, 1971, EXTENDED THE PERIOD OF STATUTORY RESTRAINT AND ALSO IMPLEMENTED THE FIRST-YEAR WAGE INCREASES RECOMMENDED BY AN EMERGENCY BOARD.

MOST RECENTLY, THERE WAS THE 1972 WEST COAST LONGSHOREMEN'S DISPUTE WHEN CONGRESS PROVIDED FOR AN IMMEDIATE END TO THE WORK STOPPAGE AND ESTABLISHED

A THREE-MEMBER ARBITRATION BOARD TO ISSUE A FINAL AND BINDING RESOLUTION OF THE CONFLICT.

CONGRESS IS NO PLACE TO SETTLE INDIVIDUAL LABOR DISPUTES, AND NOBODY KNOWS THIS BETTER THAN MEMBERS OF THE

HOUSE AND SENATE.

SO WHY IS IT THAT CONGRESS HAS BECOME A DUMPING GROUND FOR LABOR DISPUTES IN TRANSPORTATION?

FIRST OF ALL, OUR LABOR LAWS ARE OLD AND INADEQUATE.

IT IS NOW 46 YEARS SINCE PASSAGE OF THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT AND 25 YEARS SINCE TAFT-HARTLEY AMENDED THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT.

THESE TWO LAWS UNDERPIN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES. THEY PROVIDE THE FRAMEWORK FOR OUR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING SYSTEM.

IT HAS BECOME OBVIOUS THAT BOTH OF THESE LAWS CONTAIN DEFICIENCIES -- ESPECIALLY DEFICIENCIES IN DEALING WITH LABOR DISPUTES THAT PRODUCE NATIONAL EMERGENCIES. THIS IS PARTICULARLY TRUE OF

THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT.

MEANWHILE OUR ECONOMY HAS EVOLVED INTO A COMPLEX SYSTEM WHOSE PARTS ARE CLOSELY INTERMESHED. WHEN A KEY PART STOPS FUNCTIONING, THE ENTIRE ECONOMY IS OFTEN DAMAGED. YET WE HAVE A SITUATION TODAY WHERE A PRIVATE GROUP WITH FULL LEGAL PROTECTION CAN ACT TO PRODUCE A NATIONAL EMERGENCY. AND WE ALSO HAVE A SITUATION WHERE THAT SAME PRIVATE GROUP HAS SUCH TREMENDOUS INFLUENCE IN CONGRESS AS TO BE ABLE TO BLOCK REMEDIAL ACTION.

THAT'S THE SITUATION WHICH FACES US TODAY. MEANTIME THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE DEMANDING AN END TO LABOR DISPUTES THAT ENDANGER THE WHOLE ECONOMY AND CAUSE WIDESPREAD DISRUPTION OF AMERICAN LIFE.

UNFORTUNATELY THE DEMANDS WAX

LOUD WHILE THE DISRUPTION CONTINUES AND THEN SUBSIDE AFTER LABOR LEADERS AND THEIR ALLIES IN CONGRESS MANAGE TO BULL THEIR WAY THROUGH ANOTHER CRISIS.

WHILE THE NATION DEMANDS ACTION, ORGANIZED LABOR FIGHTS ANY LEGISLATION THAT MIGHT RESTRICT THE STRIKE RIGHTS OF ITS MEMBERS.

WHAT ALTERNATIVES DOES CONGRESS HAVE? IT CAN, OF COURSE, DO NOTHING -- AND THAT IS PRECISELY WHAT IT HAS BEEN DOING.

BUT THE TRUTH IS THAT CONGRESS DOES NOT REALLY HAVE THIS ALTERNATIVE UNLESS IT WANTS TO DEAL WITH NATIONAL EMERGENCY DISPUTES IN TRANSPORTATION ONE AT A TIME, AND AGAIN AND AGAIN.

THE ONLY REAL CHOICE CONGRESS HAS IS TO ENACT BASIC LEGISLATION WHICH

WILL PROVIDE NEW AND BETTER METHODS FOR HANDLING NATIONAL EMERGENCY LABOR DISPUTES IN TRANSPORTATION.

WHY DO THESE DISPUTES KEEP ENDING UP ON CONGRESS' DOORSTEP? THE ANSWER IS SIMPLE. TODAY'S BARGAINERS HAVE LOST THEIR OLD FEAR OF LETTING THEIR LABOR DISPUTES GO TO CAPITOL HILL. IN FACT, CONGRESSIONAL ACTION OFTEN PROVIDES BARGAINERS TODAY WITH AN ESCAPE FROM THE CONSEQUENCES OF THEIR OWN ACTIONS.

LOOK, FOR INSTANCE, AT WHAT HAPPENED IN DECEMBER OF 1970 WHEN CONGRESS ACTED IN THE RAILWAY DISPUTE. A PRESIDENTIAL BOARD HAD RECOMMENDED BIG WAGE INCREASES FOR FOUR UNIONS AND HAD COUPLED IT WITH SOME WORK RULE CHANGES DESIGNED TO HELP MANAGEMENT IMPROVE

PRODUCTIVITY. WHAT DID CONGRESS DO? CONGRESS PUT THE PAY INCREASES INTO EFFECT BUT NOT THE WORK RULES. WHEN ONE OF THE CARRIERS CONTENDED IT LACKED THE CASH TO PAY THE INCREASE, CONGRESS SIMPLY EXTENDED THE CARRIER A LOAN TO PAY IT.

THE CASE OF THE WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE DEVELOPED ALONG DIFFERENT LINES. IN THAT CASE, THE UNION FOUGHT SPECIAL ACTION BY THE CONGRESS BECAUSE THE LEGISLATION CALLED FOR BINDING ARBITRATION. AND LABOR'S CLOSEST ALLIES IN CONGRESS DRAGGED THEIR HEELS AS HARD AS POSSIBLE TO AVOID CONGRESSIONAL ACTION.

BUT THE TEMPER OF THE TIMES HAS CHANGED. NOT ONLY DID WE GET BINDING ARBITRATION APPROVED IN THE WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE AS AN INSURANCE POLICY AGAINST

RESUMPTION OF THAT STRIKE BUT WE ALSO CAME CLOSE TO GETTING PERMANENT LEGISLATION REPORTED OUT OF A HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE.

UNFORTUNATELY, LAST MARCH 1 SIX DEMOCRATS ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE OVERRODE THE EFFORTS OF FOUR REPUBLICANS AND SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN JOHN JARMAN OF OKLAHOMA TO ADOPT A BILL WHICH WOULD HAVE EASED THE IMPACT OF EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION STRIKES AND WOULD HAVE IMPOSED EVENTUAL MANDATORY SETTLEMENT IF NECESSARY.

THE BILL THE SUBCOMMITTEE VOTED ON WAS A COMPROMISE OFFERED BY REP. JIM HARVEY, REPUBLICAN OF SAGINAW. IT WAS A COMPROMISE BETWEEN THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSAL FOR PERMANENT STRIKE PREVENTION

LEGISLATION AND LABOR'S OPPOSITION TO COMPULSORY ARBITRATION.

HARVEY'S BILL PROVIDED FOR SELECTIVE STRIKES, WHICH IN THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY WOULD BE LIMITED TO 20 PER CENT OF REVENUE TON MILES OR TO ONE CARRIER IN EACH OF THREE SECTIONS OF THE COUNTRY.

A KEY FEATURE OF THE HARVEY BILL WAS A MAJOR PROVISION ALSO CONTAINED IN THE ADMINISTRATION BILL. THIS PROVIDED THAT CONTESTING PARTIES IN A MAJOR LABOR DISPUTE WOULD SUBMIT PROPOSED CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS AS A LAST RESORT. AND ONE OR THE OTHER OF THOSE SETTLEMENTS WOULD BE SELECTED BY AN ARBITRATOR AND IMPOSED ON THE PARTIES UNCHANGED.

ORGANIZED LABOR INSISTS THAT THIS FINAL OFFER PROPOSAL AMOUNTS TO

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION. I DO NOT SEE IT THAT WAY. THE FINAL OFFER PROCEDURE DOES NOT INVOLVE COMPULSORY ARBITRATION ALTHOUGH IT DOES INVOLVE LIMITED COMPULSION.

THESE LIMITATIONS ARE NOT "ANTI" ANYONE. THEY ARE SIMPLY "PRO" PUBLIC.

WHAT I AM SAYING IS THAT THE ADMINISTRATION'S CRIPPLING STRIKES PREVENTION ACT HAS ONE PURPOSE ONLY -- TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC WELFARE.

IT MAKES CHANGES IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AS IT IS NOW PRACTICED IN THE TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY -- LIMITED CHANGES THAT DO PLACE SOME ULTIMATE LIMITATION ON THE FREE ACTIONS OF BOTH LABOR AND MANAGEMENT. ANY LAW THAT IS DESIGNED TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC WELFARE MUST NECESSARILY

PLACE SOME LIMITATIONS ON SOMEONE.

HERE IS WHAT THE BILL DOES:

IN ONE INDUSTRY ONLY --

TRANSPORTATION -- IT GIVES THE PRESIDENT POWERS TO AVOID A WIDESPREAD CRISIS CAUSED BY A LABOR DISPUTE.

THE PRESIDENT WOULD HAVE THREE OPTIONS IN DEALING WITH DISPUTES IN THE RAILROAD, AIRLINE, MARITIME AND TRUCKING INDUSTRIES. HE COULD EXTEND THE LENGTH OF EXISTING COOLING-OFF PERIODS. HE COULD PERMIT SELECTIVE STRIKES OR REQUIRE SOME FORM OF PARTIAL OPERATION OF THE TROUBLED INDUSTRY. OR HE COULD NAME A NEUTRAL PANEL TO CHOOSE BETWEEN THE FINAL OFFERS SUBMITTED BY EACH SIDE.

AFTER THE FINAL OFFERS ARE SUBMITTED, THERE WOULD FOLLOW A FIVE-DAY

PERIOD DURING WHICH THE SECRETARY OF LABOR COULD ENGAGE IN MEDIATION ACTIVITY AND THE PARTIES COULD HAVE ONE FINAL GO AT SETTLING THE DISPUTE THEMSELVES.

THE FINAL OFFER CONCEPT IS THE KIND OF INNOVATIVE PROPOSAL WE NEED IF WE ARE TO STRENGTHEN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING.

REMEMBER, IT REQUIRES SELECTION WITHOUT MODIFICATION OF THE MORE REASONABLE OFFER OF THE TWO PARTIES THEMSELVES. THIS REQUIREMENT WOULD PUSH THE PARTIES TOWARD A MIDDLE GROUND, BECAUSE IF EITHER PARTY'S OFFER WERE EXTREME, IT WOULD BE REJECTED IN FAVOR OF THE OTHER. THE PRESENCE OF THIS PROCEDURE AS A FINAL OPTION WOULD ENCOURAGE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN EVERY STAGE OF NEGOTIATION. THE PENALTY FOR UNREASONABLENESS WOULD BE

IMPOSITION OF THE OTHER FELLOW'S LAST OFFER.

THIS APPROACH IS DESIGNED NOT ONLY TO SOLVE EMERGENCY WORK STOPPAGES BUT TO PREVENT THEM FROM OCCURRING.

THE UNIONS CONTEND THE ADMINISTRATION'S CRIPPLING STRIKES PREVENTION ACT WOULD DESTROY THE RIGHT TO STRIKE. BUT IS THAT A REALISTIC VIEW? DOES THE RAILROAD WORKER NOW HAVE AN UNLIMITED RIGHT TO STRIKE? OF COURSE NOT. THAT RIGHT IS ONLY ON PAPER. WHEN A NATIONWIDE RAIL STRIKE OCCURS, CONGRESS IMMEDIATELY GOES INTO ACTION AND PASSES A LAW THAT SENDS THE STRIKER BACK TO WORK.

IS ANYTHING <u>MORE</u> REQUIRED TO ESTABLISH THE NEED FOR CRIPPLING STRIKES

PREVENTION LEGISLATION IN TRANSPORTATION?

OUR FARMERS MAY FEEL THE EFFECTS OF THE WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE FOR 10 YEARS OR MORE. GRAIN FARMERS LOST OVER A BILLION DOLLARS IN INCOME BECAUSE OF THE WEST COAST STRIKE AND THE STRIKES BY DOCK WORKERS ON THE EAST AND GULF COASTS.

THESE STRIKES ERODED OUR OVERSEAS AGRICULTURAL MARKETING POTENTIAL FOR YEARS TO COME BECAUSE MANY GOOD CUSTOMERS WERE FORCED TO LOOK TO OTHER NATIONS TO SUPPLY THEIR FEED GRAIN NEEDS. OTHER NATIONS NOW ARE SKEPTICAL ABOUT MAKING LONGRANGE PURCHASES FROM THE UNITED STATES BECAUSE WE SEEM TO LACK THE ABILITY TO HANDLE TRANSPORTATION EMERGENCIES LIKE THE WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE.

TAKE, FOR EXAMPLE, THE JAPANESE. THEY HAVE BEEN BUYING WHEAT, TOGETHER WITH CONSIDERABLE QUANTITIES OF OTHER GRAINS, PRIMARILY FROM THE UNITED STATES. BECAUSE OF THE WEST COAST DOCK STRIKE, THE JAPANESE SHIFTED THEIR GRAIN PURCHASES TO CANADA AND AUSTRALIA. IF WE ARE EVER TO GET THIS BUSINESS BACK, IT WILL ONLY BE AFTER YEARS OF EFFORT.

CONSIDER THE RUSSIANS. LAST FALL, THE UNITED STATES ANNOUNCED AN AGREEMENT FOR THE SALE OF ABOUT $150 MILLION WORTH OF GRAIN TO RUSSIA. SINCE THEN, SOVIET OFFICIALS HAVE QUESTIONED WHETHER THE U.S. CAN BE DEPENDED UPON AS A SOURCE OF GRAIN IN VIEW OF OUR DOCK STRIKES.

IT IS TIME CONGRESS ACTED TO

CHANGE THIS SITUATION.

IT IS MORE THAN TWO YEARS NOW SINCE THE ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDED A MEASURE DESIGNED TO PREVENT CRIPPLING STRIKES IN TRANSPORTATION. IT IS INTERESTING TO NOTE THAT MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE WHICH KILLED THE MEASURE FOR THIS YEAR RECEIVED MORE THAN $40,543 MILLION IN UNION CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS. THAT'S ACCORDING TO THE CITIZENS RESEARCH FOUNDATION OF PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY.

LET'S PUT AN END TO THIS SITUATION WHICH HURTS US ALL.

THIS MAY BE TOO POLITICAL A YEAR TO SEE WORKABLE LEGISLATION IN THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY STRIKE FIELD. BUT NEXT YEAR WON'T BE IF WE HAVE A CONGRESS WHICH IS

RESPONSIBLE -- AND RESPONSIVE TO THE PUBLIC WELFARE.

YOU CAN DO SOMETHING TO SOLVE THIS CRUSHING PROBLEM. YOU CAN BE PART OF THE SOLUTION. YOU CAN EXERCISE YOUR RIGHT TO HELP DETERMINE THE SHAPE OF THE BODY WHICH WILL MAKE LAWS FOR THE NATION FOR THE NEXT TWO YEARS. THAT JOB IS IN YOUR HANDS.

-- END --

## CONGRESSIONAL ACTION IN RAILROAD DISPUTES

Five railroad disputes have resulted in enactment of legislation by the Congress. These disputes are as follows:

1. 1963 Operating Employees Manning Dispute

   - Public Law 88-108 (August 28, 1963) - Created Board of Arbitration to render binding award disposing of fireman manning and crew consist issues.

2. 1966-67 Shopcraft Employees Wage Dispute

   - Public Law 90-10 (April 12, 1967) - Provided for 20-day extension of period of statutory restraint.

   - Public Law 90-13 (May 2, 1967) - Provided for 47-day extension of period of statutory restraint.

   - Public Law 90-54 (July 17, 1967) - Established Special Board to mediate dispute and, failing settlement thru mediation, issue determination implementing Emergency Board recommendations.

3. 1969-70 Shopcraft Employees Wage Dispute

   - Public Law 91-203 (March 4, 1970) - Provided for 37-day extension of period of statutory restraint.

   - Public Law 91-226 (April 9, 1970) - Implemented parties "Memorandum of Understanding" which the members of one of the four unions involved had failed to ratify.

4. 1970-71 Wage-Work Rules Dispute

   - Public Law 91-541 (December 10, 1970) - Provided for 81-day extension of period of statutory restraint. Also implemented the first year wage increases recommended by Emergency Board.

5. 1971 Signalmen Dispute

| | |
|---|---|
| - Public Law 92-17 (May 18, 1971) | - Extended period of statutory restraint. Also implemented the first year wage increases recommended by Emergency Board. |

Congressional Action in Longshore Dispute

1. 1972 West Coast Longshore Dispute

| | |
|---|---|
| - S. J. Res. 197 (February 21, 1972) | - Provided for immediate ending of the work stoppage and established a three-member arbitration board to issue a final and binding resolution of the conflict. |

April 3, 1972

Office Copy

A SPEECH BY REP. GERALD R. FORD, R-MICH.
REPUBLICAN LEADER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

BEFORE THE WEST MICHIGAN CHAPTER OF
DELTA NU ALPHA TRANSPORTATION FRATERNITY

GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN
7 P.M. APRIL 10, 1972

Gentlemen, it's a great pleasure to be here. It is an interesting experience for me to be talking to a transportation fraternity. Speaking of transportation, did you ever get the feeling that you're going nowhere -- and have already arrived?

That, of course, is the kind of feeling we all get as Income Tax Day approaches. April 17 is Income Tax Day. That's when you're haunted by the Ghost of Earnings Past.

You remember the income tax. It's like a do-it-yourself mugging.

You should see the tax forms they use in Las Vegas. They have three boxes you can check. REFUND, APPLY TO NEXT YEAR'S TAXES, and DOUBLE OR NOTHING.

I always get an accountant to do my taxes. Through the years I have found that a Form 1040 is easier read than done.

My accountant always puts an X where I'm supposed to sign. I think it stands for the language I use when I sign it.

I have a wonderful accountant. What he doesn't know about income taxes would fill a jail cell.

I knew I was in trouble when he had to look up the instructions to fill in one space. Where it said DATE:.

Income tax time brings us the miseries. But I can tell you one thing. Leisure time is no longer a problem for any of us. Thanks to modern methods of transportation, we use it all up getting to and from work.

But, seriously, we do have tremendous problems in transportation today, and these problems have nothing to do with getting to work. They have to do with keeping the transportation industry working, keeping it from shutting down.

As you know, the President recently invoked the Railway Labor Act to delay a threatened rail strike for 60 days -- until midnight May 31.

It was also not long ago that the longest dock strike in the history of the country -- the West Coast work stoppage -- finally ended. The dock workers went back to their jobs only after three-quarters of a billion dollars in agricultural exports were lost, and only after Congress had adopted emergency legislation to make sure that our West Coast ports would begin operating again.

(more)

What this dramatizes is the fact that labor disputes in the transportation industry are bringing crisis after crisis to our nation. And these crises are repeatedly winding up in Congress' lap.

Nine times in the last nine years Congress has had to enact special legislation to restore the flow of commerce.

There was the 1963 railroad operating employes manning dispute, when Congress created a board of arbitration to render a binding award disposing of fireman manning and crew consist issues.

There was the 1966-67 railroad shopcraft employes wage dispute when Congress on April 12, 1967, provided for a 20-day extension of the period of statutory restraint...and on May 2, 1967, provided for a 47-day extension...and on July 17, 1967, established a special board to mediate the dispute and, failing settlement of the dispute through mediation, issued a determination implementing Emergency Board recommendations.

There was the 1969-70 shopcraft employes wage dispute when Congress on March 4, 1970, provided for a 37-day extension of a cooling off period and on April 9, 1970, implemented the parties' "Memorandum of Understanding" which members of one of the four unions involved had failed to ratify.

There was the 1970-71 railroad work-wage rules dispute when Congress provided for an 81-day extension of the period of statutory restraint and also implemented the first-year wage increases recommended by an Emergency Board.

There was the 1971 railroad signalmen's dispute when Congress on May 18, 1971, extended the period of statutory restraint and also implemented the first-year wage increases recommended by an Emergency Board.

Most recently, there was the 1972 West Coast longshoremen's dispute when Congress provided for an immediate end to the work stoppage and established a three-member arbitration board to issue a final and binding resolution of the conflict.

Congress is no place to settle individual labor disputes, and nobody knows this better than members of the House and Senate.

So why is it that Congress has become a dumping ground for labor disputes in transportation?

First of all, our labor laws are <u>old</u> and <u>inadequate</u>.

It is now 46 years since passage of the Railway Labor Act and 25 years since Taft-Hartley amended the National Labor Relations Act.

(more)

These two laws underpin labor-management relations in the United States. They provide the framework for our collective bargaining system.

It has become obvious that both of these laws contain deficiencies -- especially deficiencies in dealing with labor disputes that produce national emergencies. This is particularly true of the Railway Labor Act.

Meanwhile our economy has evolved into a complex system whose parts are closely intermeshed. When a key part stops functioning, theentire economy is often damaged. Yet we have a situation today where a private group with full legal protection can act to produce a national emergency. And we also have a situation where that same private group has such tremendous influence in Congress as to be able to block remedial action.

That's the situation which faces us today. Meantime the American people are demanding an end to labor disputes that endanger the whole economy and cause widespread disruption of American life.

Unfortunately the demands wax loud while the disruption continues and then subside after labor leaders and their allies in Congress manage to bull their way through another crisis.

While the Nation demands action, organized labor fights any legislation that might restrict the strike rights of its members.

What alternatives does Congress have? It can, of course, do nothing -- and that is precisely what it has been doing.

But the truth is that Congress does not really have this alternative unless it wants to deal with national emergency disputes in transportation one at a time, and again and again.

The only real choice Congress has is to enact basic legislation which will provide new and better methods for handling national emergency labor disputes in transportation.

Why do these disputes keep ending up on Congress' doorstep? The answer is simple. Today's bargainers have lost their old fear of letting their labor disputes go to Capitol Hill. In fact, Congressional action often provides bargainers today with an escape from the consequences of their own actions.

Look, for instance, at what happened in December of 1970 when Congress acted in the railway dispute. A Presidential Board had recommended big wage increases for four unions and had coupled it with some work rule changes designed to help management improve productivity. What did Congress do? Congress put the pay

(more)

increases into effect but not the work rules. When one of the carriers contended it lacked the cash to pay the increase, Congress simply extended the carrier a loan to pay it.

The case of the West Coast dock strike developed along different lines. In that case, the union fought special action by the Congress because the legislation called for binding arbitration. And labor's closest allies in Congress dragged their heels as hard as possible to avoid Congressional action.

But the temper of the times has changed. Not only did we get binding arbitration approved in the West Coast dock strike as an insurance policy against resumption of that strike but we also came close to getting permanent legislation reported out of a House subcommittee.

Unfortunately, last March 1 six Democrats on the subcommittee overrode the efforts of four Republicans and subcommittee chairman John Jarman of Oklahoma to adopt a bill which would have eased the impact of emergency transportation strikes and would have imposed eventual mandatory settlement if necessary.

The bill the subcommittee voted on was a compromise offered by Rep. Jim Harvey, Republican of Saginaw. It was a compromise between the Administration's proposal for permanent strike prevention legislation and labor's opposition to compulsory arbitration.

Harvey's bill provided for selective strikes, which in the railroad industry would be limited to 20 per cent of revenue ton miles or to one carrier in each of three sections of the country.

A key feature of the Harvey bill was a major provision also contained in the Administration bill. This provided that contesting parties in a major labor dispute would submit proposed contract settlements as a last resort. And one or the other of those settlements would be selected by an arbitrator and imposed on the parties unchanged.

Organized labor insists that this final offer proposal amounts to compulsory arbitration. I do not see it that way. The final offer procedure does not involve compulsory arbitration although it does involve <u>limited compulsion</u>.

These limitations are not "anti" anyone. They are simply "pro" public.

What I am saying is that the Administration's crippling strikes prevention act has one purpose only -- to protect the public welfare.

It makes changes in collective bargaining as it is now practiced in the transportation industry -- limited changes that do place some ultimate limitation

(more)

on the free actions of both labor and management. Any law that is designed to protect the public welfare must necessarily place some limitations on someone.

Here is what the bill does:

In one industry only -- transportation -- it gives the President powers to avoid a widespread crisis caused by a labor dispute.

The President would have three options in dealing with disputes in the railroad, airline, maritime and trucking industries. He could extend the length of existing cooling-off periods. He could permit selective strikes or require some form of partial operation of the troubled industry. Or he could name a neutral panel to choose between the final offers submitted by each side.

After the final offers are submitted, there would follow a five-day period during which the Secretary of Labor could engage in mediation activity and the parties could have one final go at settling the dispute themselves.

The final offer concept is the kind of innovative proposal we need if we are to strengthen collective bargaining.

Remember, it requires selection without modification of the more reasonable offer of the two parties themselves. This requirement would push the parties toward a middle ground, because if either party's offer were extreme, it would be rejected in favor of the other. The presence of this procedure as a final option would encourage collective bargaining in every stage of negotiation. The penalty for unreasonableness would be imposition of the other fellow's last offer.

This approach is designed not only to solve emergency work stoppages but to prevent them from occurring.

The unions contend the Administration's Crippling Strikes Prevention Act would destroy the right to strike. But is that a realistic view? Does the railroad worker now have an unlimited right to strike? Of course not. That right is only on paper. When a nationwide rail strike occurs, Congress immediately goes into action and passes a law that sends the striker back to work.

Is anything <u>more</u> required to establish the need for Crippling Strikes Prevention legislation in transportation?

Our farmers may feel the effects of the West Coast dock strike for 10 years or more. Grain farmers lost over a billion dollars in income because of the West Coast strike and the strikes by dock workers on the East and Gulf coasts.

These strikes eroded our overseas agricultural marketing potential for years to come because many good customers were forced to look to other nations

(more)

to supply their feed grain needs. Other nations now are skeptical about making longrange purchases from the United States because we seem to lack the ability to handle transportation emergencies like the West Coast dock strike.

Take, for example, the Japanese. They have been buying wheat, together with considerable quantities of other grains, primarily from the United States. Because of the West Coast dock strike, the Japanese shifted their grain purchases to Canada and Austra lia. If we are ever to get this business back, it will only be after years of effort.

Consider the Russians. Last fall, the United States announced an agreement for the sale of about $150 million worth of grain to Russia. Since then, Soviet officials have questioned whether the U.S. can be depended upon as a source of grain in view of our dock strikes.

It is time Congress acted to change this situation.

It is more than two years now since the Administration recommended a measure designed to prevent crippling strikes in transportation. It is interesting to note that members of the House subcommittee which killed the measure for this year received more than $40,543 million in union campaign contributions. That's according to the Citizens Research Foundation of Princeton, N.J.

Let's put an end to this situation which hurts us all.

This may be too political a year to see workable legislation in the national emergency strike field. But next year won't be if we have a Congress which is responsible -- and responsive to the public welfare.

You can do something to solve this crushing problem. You can be part of the solution. You can exercise your right to help determine the shape of the body which will make laws for the Nation for the next two years. That job is in your hands.

# # #

Office Copy

A SPEECH BY REP. GERALD R. FORD, R-MICH.
REPUBLICAN LEADER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

BEFORE THE WEST MICHIGAN CHAPTER OF
DELTA NU ALPHA TRANSPORTATION FRATERNITY

GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN
7 P.M. APRIL 10, 1972

Gentlemen, it's a great pleasure to be here. It is an interesting experience for me to be talking to a transportation fraternity. Speaking of transportation, did you ever get the feeling that you're going nowhere -- and have already arrived?

That, of course, is the kind of feeling we all get as Income Tax Day approaches. April 17 is Income Tax Day. That's when you're haunted by the Ghost of Earnings Past.

You remember the income tax. It's like a do-it-yourself mugging.

You should see the tax forms they use in Las Vegas. They have three boxes you can check. REFUND, APPLY TO NEXT YEAR'S TAXES, and DOUBLE OR NOTHING.

I always get an accountant to do my taxes. Through the years I have found that a Form 1040 is easier read than done.

My accountant always puts an X where I'm supposed to sign. I think it stands for the language I use when I sign it.

I have a wonderful accountant. What he doesn't know about income taxes would fill a jail cell.

I knew I was in trouble when he had to look up the instructions to fill in one space. Where it said DATE:.

Income tax time brings us the miseries. But I can tell you one thing. Leisure time is no longer a problem for any of us. Thanks to modern methods of transportation, we use it all up getting to and from work.

But, seriously, we do have tremendous problems in transportation today, and these problems have nothing to do with getting to work. They have to do with keeping the transportation industry working, keeping it from shutting down.

As you know, the President recently invoked the Railway Labor Act to delay a threatened rail strike for 60 days -- until midnight May 31.

It was also not long ago that the longest dock strike in the history of the country -- the West Coast work stoppage -- finally ended. The dock workers went back to their jobs only after three-quarters of a billion dollars in agricultural exports were lost, and only after Congress had adopted emergency legislation to make sure that our West Coast ports would begin operating again.

(more)

What this dramatizes is the fact that labor disputes in the transportation industry are bringing crisis after crisis to our nation. And these crises are repeatedly winding up in Congress' lap.

Nine times in the last nine years Congress has had to enact special legislation to restore the flow of commerce.

There was the 1963 railroad operating employes manning dispute, when Congress created a board of arbitration to render a binding award disposing of fireman manning and crew consist issues.

There was the 1966-67 railroad shopcraft employes wage dispute when Congress on April 12, 1967, provided for a 20-day extension of the period of statutory restraint...and on May 2, 1967, provided for a 47-day extension...and on July 17, 1967, established a special board to mediate the dispute and, failing settlement of the dispute through mediation, issued a determination implementing Emergency Board recommendations.

There was the 1969-70 shopcraft employes wage dispute when Congress on March 4, 1970, provided for a 37-day extension of a cooling off period and on April 9, 1970, implemented the parties' "Memorandum of Understanding" which members of one of the four unions involved had failed to ratify.

There was the 1970-71 railroad work-wage rules dispute when Congress provided for an 81-day extension of the period of statutory restraint and also implemented the first-year wage increases recommended by an Emergency Board.

There was the 1971 railroad signalmen's dispute when Congress on May 18, 1971, extended the period of statutory restraint and also implemented the first-year wage increases recommended by an Emergency Board.

Most recently, there was the 1972 West Coast longshoremen's dispute when Congress provided for an immediate end to the work stoppage and established a three-member arbitration board to issue a final and binding resolution of the conflict.

Congress is no place to settle individual labor disputes, and nobody knows this better than members of the House and Senate.

So why is it that Congress has become a dumping ground for labor disputes in transportation?

First of all, our labor laws are <u>old</u> and <u>inadequate</u>.

It is now 46 years since passage of the Railway Labor Act and 25 years since Taft-Hartley amended the National Labor Relations Act.

(more)

These two laws underpin labor-management relations in the United States. They provide the framework for our collective bargaining system.

It has become obvious that both of these laws contain deficiencies -- especially deficiencies in dealing with labor disputes that produce national emergencies. This is particularly true of the Railway Labor Act.

Meanwhile our economy has evolved into a complex system whose parts are closely intermeshed. When a key part stops functioning, theentire economy is often damaged. Yet we have a situation today where a private group with full legal protection can act to produce a national emergency. And we also have a situation where that same private group has such tremendous influence in Congress as to be able to block remedial action.

That's the situation which faces us today. Meantime the American people are demanding an end to labor disputes that endanger the whole economy and cause widespread disruption of American life.

Unfortunately the demands wax loud while the disruption continues and then subside after labor leaders and their allies in Congress manage to bull their way through another crisis.

While the Nation demands action, organized labor fights any legislation that might restrict the strike rights of its members.

What alternatives does Congress have? It can, of course, do nothing -- and that is precisely what it has been doing.

But the truth is that Congress does not really have this alternative unless it wants to deal with national emergency disputes in transportation one at a time, and again and again.

The only real choice Congress has is to enact basic legislation which will provide new and better methods for handling national emergency labor disputes in transportation.

Why do these disputes keep ending up on Congress' doorstep? The answer is simple. Today's bargainers have lost their old fear of letting their labor disputes go to Capitol Hill. In fact, Congressional action often provides bargainers today with an escape from the consequences of their own actions.

Look, for instance, at what happened in December of 1970 when Congress acted in the railway dispute. A Presidential Board had recommended big wage increases for four unions and had coupled it with some work rule changes designed to help management improve productivity. What did Congress do? Congress put the pay

(more)

increases into effect but not the work rules. When one of the carriers contended it lacked the cash to pay the increase, Congress simply extended the carrier a loan to pay it.

The case of the West Coast dock strike developed along different lines. In that case, the union fought special action by the Congress because the legislation called for binding arbitration. And labor's closest allies in Congress dragged their heels as hard as possible to avoid Congressional action.

But the temper of the times has changed. Not only did we get binding arbitration approved in the West Coast dock strike as an insurance policy against resumption of that strike but we also came close to getting permanent legislation reported out of a House subcommittee.

Unfortunately, last March 1 six Democrats on the subcommittee overrode the efforts of four Republicans and subcommittee chairman John Jarman of Oklahoma to adopt a bill which would have eased the impact of emergency transportation strikes and would have imposed eventual mandatory settlement if necessary.

The bill the subcommittee voted on was a compromise offered by Rep. Jim Harvey, Republican of Saginaw. It was a compromise between the Administration's proposal for permanent strike prevention legislation and labor's opposition to compulsory arbitration.

Harvey's bill provided for selective strikes, which in the railroad industry would be limited to 20 per cent of revenue ton miles or to one carrier in each of three sections of the country.

A key feature of the Harvey bill was a major provision also contained in the Administration bill. This provided that contesting parties in a major labor dispute would submit proposed contract settlements as a last resort. And one or the other of those settlements would be selected by an arbitrator and imposed on the parties unchanged.

Organized labor insists that this final offer proposal amounts to compulsory arbitration. I do not see it that way. The final offer procedure does not involve compulsory arbitration although it does involve <u>limited compulsion</u>.

These limitations are not "anti" anyone. They are simply "pro" public.

What I am saying is that the Administration's crippling strikes prevention act has one purpose only -- to protect the public welfare.

It makes changes in collective bargaining as it is now practiced in the transportation industry -- limited changes that do place some ultimate limitation

(more)

on the free actions of both labor and management. Any law that is designed to protect the public welfare must necessarily place some limitations on someone.

Here is what the bill does:

In one industry only -- transportation -- it gives the President powers to avoid a widespread crisis caused by a labor dispute.

The President would have three options in dealing with disputes in the railroad, airline, maritime and trucking industries. He could extend the length of existing cooling-off periods. He could permit selective strikes or require some form of partial operation of the troubled industry. Or he could name a neutral panel to choose between the final offers submitted by each side.

After the final offers are submitted, there would follow a five-day period during which the Secretary of Labor could engage in mediation activity and the parties could have one final go at settling the dispute themselves.

The final offer concept is the kind of innovative proposal we need if we are to strengthen collective bargaining.

Remember, it requires selection without modification of the more reasonable offer of the two parties themselves. This requirement would push the parties toward a middle ground, because if either party's offer were extreme, it would be rejected in favor of the other. The presence of this procedure as a final option would encourage collective bargaining in every stage of negotiation. The penalty for unreasonableness would be imposition of the other fellow's last offer.

This approach is designed not only to solve emergency work stoppages but to prevent them from occurring.

The unions contend the Administration's Crippling Strikes Prevention Act would destroy the right to strike. But is that a realistic view? Does the railroad worker now have an unlimited right to strike? Of course not. That right is only on paper. When a nationwide rail strike occurs, Congress immediately goes into action and passes a law that sends the striker back to work.

Is anything <u>more</u> required to establish the need for Crippling Strikes Prevention legislation in transportation?

Our farmers may feel the effects of the West Coast dock strike for 10 years or more. Grain farmers lost over a billion dollars in income because of the West Coast strike and the strikes by dock workers on the East and Gulf coasts.

These strikes eroded our overseas agricultural marketing potential for years to come because many good customers were forced to look to other nations

(more)

to supply their feed grain needs. Other nations now are skeptical about making longrange purchases from the United States because we seem to lack the ability to handle transportation emergencies like the West Coast dock strike.

Take, for example, the Japanese. They have been buying wheat, together with considerable quantities of other grains, primarily from the United States. Because of the West Coast dock strike, the Japanese shifted their grain purchases to Canada and Austra lia. If we are ever to get this business back, it will only be after years of effort.

Consider the Russians. Last fall, the United States announced an agreement for the sale of about $150 million worth of grain to Russia. Since then, Soviet officials have questioned whether the U.S. can be depended upon as a source of grain in view of our dock strikes.

It is time Congress acted to change this situation.

It is more than two years now since the Administration recommended a measure designed to prevent crippling strikes in transportation. It is interesting to note that members of the House subcommittee which killed the measure for this year received more than $40,543 million in union campaign contributions. That's according to the Citizens Research Foundation of Princeton, N.J.

Let's put an end to this situation which hurts us all.

This may be too political a year to see workable legislation in the national emergency strike field. But next year won't be if we have a Congress which is responsible -- and responsive to the public welfare.

You can do something to solve this crushing problem. You can be part of the solution. You can exercise your right to help determine the shape of the body which will make laws for the Nation for the next two years. That job is in your hands.

# # #