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Wirtz. Few of us would have had the endurance to stand up under such an extended and frustrating ordeal—and "frustrating" is the proper term. Sometimes the indications were that headway was being made in the process; other times the reverse was true. Meanwhile, the committee, Congress, and the Nation are aware of the deadlock which confronts the Nation if the parties to the dispute carry out their intentions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that during the course of the negotiations the majority leader on at least five, possibly six, occasions held meetings in his office, meetings which were attended by the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. Mansfield, after the vote on the joint resolution, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pastore), who for much of the time was acting chairman of the committee, and with other Senators, and that at those times various proposals were advanced seeking to bring about an accommodation of the parties, seeking to bring about a settlement of the dispute, and thereby avoid the necessity of legislation? Is not that a correct statement?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not only is that a correct statement; but the majority leader also held conferences and worked with the Secretary of Labor. I am sure the majority leader talked with the parties to the dispute themselves. Most of the members of the committee have done so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I must state for the Record that I tried to keep the meetings unpublicized and private, away from the press, the television, and the representatives of both sides to the dispute, because they were not in attendance at those meetings. It was a problem with which the Congress was confronted, and to which a solution had to be found, if the parties themselves did not agree to some sort of settlement.

So far as the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island is concerned, he never attended a meeting; he was always on the lookout for a possible settlement. He worked long hours and tried to do the best he could.

Speaking of the unanimous vote by which the joint resolution was reported from committee, if my memory serves me correctly, the Senator from Rhode Island, after the vote on the joint resolution, left the city and did not know about the so-called 9-to-8 division until he returned this morning.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not like the connotation "left the city." I went home.

(Laughter.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. I stand corrected.

Mr. PASTORE. But I say to the Senator from Montana that one thing the Senator from Rhode Island did not do was to get on his knees and beg both sides to resolve their differences through the process of collective bargaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Let us face the fact: These were the issues that were pending as of November 2, 1959. Many issues have arisen since then, and many more will arise in the future.

The carriers will have to live with the brotherhoods. I am saying this because they are decorating our galleries today. The brotherhoods will have to live with the carriers. Sooner or later they will begin to look in one another's eyes. The sooner they begin to look in one another's eyes, the sooner they will begin to bring about a better understanding between themselves, the better off Congress will be, the better off the country will be, and the better off management and labor will be in the operation of the railroads; because this is the beginning of nothing. This proposal will merely resolve what has been going on for some time and has never been insurmountable—and I can understand why: because they are intricate, complex, and involve the bread and butter problems which were called by the committee (Mr. Pastore), who for much of the time was acting chairman of the committee, and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pastore), who has, over the years, made many contributions to the betterment of labor in this country. I wish to say to all of them that even though the plan I suggested did not meet with their approval, because of conditions over which they had no control, and although the plan which we thought had met with approval on Wednesday or Thursday of last week did not come to fruition, nevertheless we did try—and I am not saying this defensively—to arrive at an equitable area wherein agreement could be reached.

When the distinguished chairman of the committee used the word "automation," he put his finger on the biggest difficulty which the rail industry and other segments of the economy face today.

Let me point out, for the Record, that the day after the President sent us his message and his proposal on the rail dispute, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Morse) introduced a joint resolution seeking to bring about a congressional study to cope with the problem of automation, to the end that, insofar as possible, in advance rather than at the end, as seems to be the case at the present time, I believe that the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. Javits) joined the Senator from Oregon in the introduction of that joint resolution at that time. I think the Record should be made clear.
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As the Senator from New York says, in effect, all we can do is to "Call them as we see them" and "Let the cards fall where they may."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have two points which I should like to make to the Senator. First, the Senator spoke of automation and the Presidential Commission on Automation. Together with the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. Morse), I have introduced a Joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 105. Because the President's plan went down the drain, it does not mean that the question of what to do about automation should similarly go down the drain.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from New York may be assured of my support, for whatever it is worth. I am delighted to know that he and the Senator from Oregon are combining their talents to carry out the recommendation made by the President last month.

Mr. JAVITS. Having in mind what the majority leader has said about the joint resolution and his own unhappiness with it, let me state why I finally voted for it. Perhaps it might be of some interest to him and to other Senators.

It was a troublesome question for me. I feared very much to undertake a course of compulsory arbitration. But the problem of keeping the country operating dictated strongly to me the need for the residual power of seizure in the President.

Also, in thinking the problem through, I felt that the only choice which was offered in order to keep the country running was the joint resolution. Notwithstanding my own desires, I felt I could not, in good conscience, indulge the luxury of standing out and saying, "No," as a matter of principle, when I knew this was the only way left, all other routes having been exhausted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the sentiments expressed by the distinguished Senator from New York. While there are few measures that satisfy any of us completely, the joint resolution raises many questions, so far as labor and possible legislation in the future are concerned.

I would hope that labor would take this to heart.