

1969

Discussion - Luncheon

Recommended Citation

Discussion - Luncheon, 35 J. AIR L. & COM. 393 (1969)
<https://scholar.smu.edu/jalc/vol35/iss3/9>

This Symposium is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at SMU Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Air Law and Commerce by an authorized administrator of SMU Scholar. For more information, please visit <http://digitalrepository.smu.edu>.

processes cannot be improved. For example, I am aware of certain suggestions by the industry to improve the function of the National Mediation Board. Some of the proposed changes, such as longer periods of office for Board members and the specialization of mediators in some areas, would meet with our approval. Perhaps some joint effort would result in necessary changes. Certainly this symposium constitutes a useful forum wherein ideas may be exchanged. I do urge, however, that we proceed with realistic objectivity. Moreover, I hope Southern Methodist University, as well as others, continues to assist in the attempt to find more useful processes. It is ALPA's intention to contribute whenever it can.

DISCUSSION — LUNCHEON

The comments made by the speakers are their own personal remarks and do not necessarily represent the official view of any organization or agency they represent.

MR. MARK KAHN: I would like a very brief response on the question of multi-employer bargaining in the industry.

MR. TERRELL SHRADER: Multi-employer bargaining, Mark, I think is a question, of course, that has been battled around for a long time, and I do not think you can give a categorical answer to it. I think there are situations where it would be helpful especially if you want to deal with the various issues that are subject to multi-employer bargaining with common unions. In other areas I would be very much opposed to it. Things that deal specifically with Braniff, for example.

MR. DAN ZAICH: I would like to ask Kay if he would elaborate on the cycle he spoke of.

MR. KAY McMURRAY: Dan, I was afraid someone was going to ask that. It arose first from my secretary's standpoint because as you may have gathered I made a few brief notes about 4:30 before I came down here, my secretary typed them, and when she got all through I said "what do you think?" She said "it's a little disconnected—what does this cycle mean?" I said, "well, I suppose if I had more time to polish it up it would be a lot better." She said, "well, Mr. McMurray you've only had since last October to do it." I don't know that I could elaborate much more, but I cannot get away from the feeling as I talk to people much older than I, and with some of the experiences I have had, that I find myself back in somewhat the same posture that we assumed some 15 years ago or so. We might be described as a little more self-help than the statute presently allowed, a little bit more akin to the description the AFL-CIO man made and it seems to me based on what you people tell me, your being confronted with that, we may now be back in that posture. We were there once and we came out of it. And you know cycles are not uncommon in either business or nature, anywhere you want to go. So what I was really saying was I think we have come around full cycle, we have learned something and now we can start right out again maybe with the procedures we have without too much concern, provided we stay within them. Is that responsive to your question?

End of Thursday luncheon discussion.