

The invitations to the other participants, and they were people from the Government, were made in a number of ways. I think I may have, for example, been responsible for telephoning the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Assistant Secretary Lee being the representative from there.

Mr. MACDONALD. In general, you are the gentleman who issued the invitation, so I am talking to the correct person.

Mr. IGNATIUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MACDONALD. Inasmuch as we on the committee received the telegram sent to the Department of Transportation, and I think the record will show that it went out on the 8th, and I questioned the Secretary of Transportation, Mr. Boyd, and in response to a question to me, he said, "No, there wasn't going to be a meeting because * * *" he didn't think a meeting was necessary, that the job, as you have indicated, was just too tough to be done and, therefore, nothing would be served if such a meeting were held—and I think I paraphrase his testimony correctly.

Let me mention this to you: I went into the same matter, subsequently, with the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz. While I was questioning Mr. Wirtz, sometime later he sent somebody out on the phone and when he came back he indicated that he had talked with someone at the Department of Defense and they had indicated the fact that, yes, they would hold the meeting.

Doesn't it seem to you that if there are two people to a dispute, and one of the parties says that it is possible to move goods that are essential to defense and national health and welfare, and the other party says no, the other party being the railroads, that they say no, it is impossible, wouldn't you think it would be a good move to get them in the same room to find out why one says that it is possible, the people who work the trains, and have the people who own the freight cars, who say no, it is not possible?

Wouldn't it be reasonable to have them in the same room to hear both sides of the story?

Mr. IGNATIUS. We were informed by Messrs. Fox and Leighty—

Mr. MACDONALD. Since my time is limited, I will ask the same question in a different way. Since I believe it is very reasonable, why didn't the Defense Department think it reasonable? Why didn't they have the railroads there to defend their point of view?

Mr. IGNATIUS. We felt that the purpose of the meeting was to hear the proposal that Messrs. Fox and Leighty had offered to present, and that under those circumstances it would be appropriate to meet with them.

Mr. MACDONALD. In other words, the Pentagon, I know, has many more problems than just moving trains. Therefore, I would think the people who would know the most about moving the trains, outside of the people who work on the trains, are the people who operate the trains in the sense of owning them.

I just can't understand why they weren't invited to this meeting unless the Department of Transportation was joined by the Department of Defense in having a preconceived notion that nothing would come of this meeting. Fifty minutes, with one side not even represented, doesn't seem to me to be a very thoroughgoing back-and-forth of the subject. I quite frankly don't understand it.