

unemployment insurance; all phases of the operation of this particular industry, and these would lead to other problems.

Additionally, where, then, do we draw the line? Why don't we admit that eventually the Government would have to go into every kind of industry? I think that makes seizure that much more unpalatable.

I would think if you got into seizure, in effect, the parties from that point on would probably be resigned to never really effectively attempt collective bargaining. It would be "We will let the Government take it over."

I think in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Florida, you said the parties have been given ample opportunity. Whether it has been 18 months or 3 years that this has been going on, surely we must say that the parties have been given every fair and reasonable chance to get together and they have not done it.

So it seems to me, then, that after having gone on for upward of 3 years, somebody has to say at some point, "This is a solution; this is a fair and equitable answer." I take it that is what you attempt in this resolution to do.

I think we have reached a point, Mr. Secretary, and this is not a question but just a feeling of my own, where the U.S. Congress or the Government must say to the unions and must say to management that, "You are not bigger than the Government." We must say to the union and to the railroads, "You are not above regulation, and you are not above the law."

Even though none of us want to weaken collective bargaining, I think we have reached a point where we must say that collective bargaining, or even the right to strike, is not above Holy Writ. It is not holier than the scriptures. Therefore, it is not improper for us to consider this resolution.

For us to consider this bill, the resolution that you have, in my opinion is not an attack on motherhood. It is not an attack on our patriotism. I think it is an honest effort by your Government to try to find a solution to the problem that has been nagging and hanging on, threatening, upward of 3 years.

Some members have asked for additional information to be submitted for the record, letters, conferences, inserts, a very full submission about wages, as if we ourselves were going to establish which is fair and right.

The inference has been, Mr. Secretary, it seems to me, that we are not quite satisfied that there is either an emergency or that somebody would be hurt, or that the health would be affected, and other similar doubts. To me it would be as if you were to make a statement that "you would be seriously hurt if you were run over by a railroad locomotive," and then for some member to ask that written proof be submitted to prove that you would be hurt if you were run over by a locomotive.

I think it is fine to have this information, but we are really just delaying the answer. I think this committee must measure up to its responsibilities. I do not agree with you that we do not need to be considering some kind of permanent legislation. I think that is long overdue. But I assume what you are trying to do is to limit your discussion to this specific resolution and the consideration of permanent legislation is something we must face at some other point.