

when you make one of these agreements after 30 or 40 hours without sleep it is a wonder that contracts do not come out worse than they do. About 6 or 7 weeks after these things are over you will be reading the contract and you will wonder where you left your brains the night you wrote it.

This is a means of bringing in a third party who is skilled in this matter, and we have many who are quite skilled, fortunately. And they listen to both sides and make a binding decision as to what the meaning of that contract is and what you will do. This, I think, is generally accepted by unions and management as being a very desirable sort of thing. Because, it is in essence no different than two citizens who have quarreled going into a court of law. The contract is the law under which we live and the arbitrator is the judge who determines it. The reward you get for this is that this is settled by reason and not by conflict.

A second use for arbitration is for a third party to determine the contract terms after listening to both sides. Most managements, and I am sure that mine is one, will not let a third party determine the course of our company as to costs or anything else. This is one place where we will take a strike. On the other hand, in some quasi-public things such as the bus company in New York, there is a permanent board that determines these things, and the question is getting Mike Quill to accept it. But this is a device that often is used, and of course it is a very popular one with the unions. The unions figure they are going to get something out of this; that it may not be too bad. And when you look at something like the Morse Committee on longshoremen, they have got a real point.

The third thing is compulsory arbitration. Compulsory arbitration has been tried in some other countries--primarily Australia and New Zealand--and, of course, where you have compulsory arbitration no one is going to settle anything when they can go to court, because in any bargaining one side feels its position is strong and the other feels it is not. So, the strong side or the weak side, one or the other, is going to run to court for compulsory arbitration.

To my mind the worst thing about compulsory arbitration is that when you have a board to determine costs, which is what this in effect is, the next thing is that you are going to have to have control of prices. And when you have control of costs and prices the next