



### As We See It

By DAN PATRICK

And now comes Congress to take a crack at the industrial strike which has produced the greatest domestic crisis in America since the dark days of 1932.

Certainly the administration's "stop gap" methods of dealing with these disputes have been ineffective. True, the steel walkout has been postponed a week and the telephone strike is off for another thirty days.

But even the report of the President's fact-finding board failed to solve the General Motors-UAW dispute. The electrical workers went out Tuesday and the meat-packers stopped work yesterday.

These labor disputes already have cut deep into the nation's reconstruction program and are bound to have an even more serious effect unless some formula is found for their solution.

The administration hasn't been able to call a halt. Now Congress is about to take a hand. The pattern of proposed legislation is an interesting study and seems directed primarily at fixing heavier responsibility on unions. This tendency, perhaps, reflects a growing concern about the role unions have played and will continue to play in our everyday life.

If a national poll were taken at the present moment on the question of popular support for industry or labor, we venture a guess that labor would wind up on the short end.

Organized labor exists, to a large extent, by public toleration and the public, to say the least, is pretty much irritated at the present time with a tendency to blame labor for our economic ills.

A blanket charge of this kind is not only unfair but incorrect. It would be just as incorrect to say that labor is entirely blameless and management 100 percent wrong.

Some of our industrialists stubbornly refuse to recognize the facts of life by conceding the labor unions do now—and will continue—to form an integral part of our economy. That type of thinking never will resolve current disputes.

In some instances of recent date labor has made excessive demands on management. Take the matter of a flat 30 percent wage increase as requested by the UAW with the claim that General Motors could meet such an increase without raising prices.

With all due respect to Walter Reuther and his UAW strategists, that seems to be too much of a good thing. Perhaps it can be done at some future time and perhaps the UAW can prove that it can be done to the public's satisfaction. But not now. It would seem that a union would have to have a much more detailed grasp of the operations of management before making such a claim.

The very fact that an impartial group such as the President's fact-finding board can at best recommend a 17 1/2 percent increase is the best evidence that a fundamental weakness exists in the original UAW claim. And to back up this assertion is the newly-adopted policy by the UAW to settle all outstanding disputes with General Motors, Ford and Chrysler under the 17 1/2 percent formula.

It is further reported that CIO President Philip Murray brought some of his UAW lieutenants back to earth the past week with the advice to forget management economics for the time being and stick to the pay increase demand.

Congress, they tell us, is in a crackdown mood as far as labor is concerned. We sincerely hope that they don't let their tempers run away with their better judgments or we shall wind up with a legislative fiasco comparable to that mockery known as the Smith Connally act.

There seems to be real merit in the bill proposed by Congresswoman Luce of Connecticut calling for resumption of studies, abandoned some years ago, of profit sharing between employers and employees as a means of avoiding strikes.

And don't overlook the bill proposed by Senator Byrd of Virginia. It strikes at a point which sound-thinking friends of labor concede is vulnerable—union responsibility.

The Byrd measure proposes: That within six months and annually thereafter, all unions would register with the SEC and report annually to that commission, among other information, their initiation fees, annual dues assessments paid, limitations on membership, number of laid-up members, salaries of officers, date and method of the last election of officers, the vote for and against each candidate, reserves in the treasury, the date of the last detailed financial statement to all members and the method of publication or circulation of such statement.

That every labor organization having as members one or more employes or persons engaged in commerce take out articles of incorporation under the laws of the District of Columbia.

That labor unions could be sued for civil damages for breach of employment contracts or for the unlawful damage or destruction of property. That no labor organization would be entitled to any rights, privileges or benefits under the National Labor Relations Act unless and until it complied with the provisions of the measure.

## STRANGE BUT TRUE

### Little-Known Facts for Catholics

By M. J. MURRAY



## Washington

### 'Ins' Split by Strikes, Army Headache in Reich

Washington — EKCL/SIVE — ability-to-pay ideas have split the left-wing and the world of CIO. Most of the old-time labor leaders within that organization are bitter against Walter Reuther, the GM strike chief, for ever bringing up that subject.

The Administration is split wide open over what strategy to use to prevent and settle strikes. It is on trial with the American people and unless it can produce a workable and effective policy both labor and business will be alienated and the Democrats will have a hit a critical political blow.

For example, Agriculture Secretary Anderson is using his influence to get higher prices for the meat packers, and John S. Sauer, Reconversion Director, worked for a boost in steel prices. Raising their potential pressure are OPA Administrator Chester Bowles, Commerce Secretary Wallace, Labor Secretary Schweilenbach and others. Whoever loses may have to step out of the political scene—so fierce is this fight.

In the middle is President Truman. By and large, his sympathies are with the Bowles, Wallace, Schweilenbach team. He sincerely believes that industry can well afford to pay substantially higher salaries and still make a handsome profit this year. And he believes that if prices are allowed to rise labor will be back in six months demanding still higher wages.

Yet, despite Charlie Ross's evidence of letters received, the President's radio appeal of two weeks ago did not ring the bell. In fact, it created a lot of dissension and resentment among his key leaders in Congress. Despite their private opinions, they know he is in the driver's seat, however. It is an election year and the Democrats can't fight openly with the President. And another important factor: Democratic Chairman Robert Hannegan will follow up the President's speech with patronage and political favors for those members who go along with the program.

It will probably take Congress a month to get down to business after it returns. If was supposed a week or two ago, but the fact-finding and the

## Religion Recognized By Yale Head

By J. J. GILBERT

Washington — The current plan by President Charles Seymour of Yale University for the establishment of a Department of Religion at that venerable institution of learning is of widespread interest and should give pause to those who are inclined to disregard the place of religion when talking in terms of education in this country.

President Seymour said in his annual report to the university's 51,000 alumni, that a faculty committee's survey of Yale had revealed the fact that the time is ripe for a further awakening in the students of the consciousness of spiritual values. He said it was desirable to establish at Yale a "University Department of Religion," with its own budget, and that it be made responsible for the integration of undergraduate and graduate courses.

"That we wish to strengthen religion at Yale is a fact, and whatever can be achieved in this direction will lighten the service of the University to the nation in the years ahead," President Seymour said.

A declaration of this kind by the head of one of the country's oldest and largest universities should serve to recall to the American public that Catholic colleges and universities since the very beginning of this country have given religion its proper place in academic life. It might recall, too, the responsible American scholars — in naming the delegation to represent the United States at the United Nations educational conference in London, men whose agencies close to overlook this fact. Not a single representative of Catholic education was a member of the commission. If President Seymour thinks that Yale can make a contribution to the nation by starting now, and by having a department of religion, how much have Catholic institutions contributed to our greatness since the revolution?

President Seymour also warned of the danger of political control of universities, saying it would be "disastrous for our academic morale if the universities become involved in a scramble for the contents of a research park barrel." He defined academic freedom as "the university's right to be free to teach what we think is right, free to do it in the way we think best, and free to admit students, to exclude them, according to our own estimate of their capacity."

Observers of the European scene are beginning now to appreciate the courage demonstrated by American and Hungarian voters in administering whopping defeats to communist candidates and to Soviet puppetry by their recent elections. The communists had made loud and exaggerated claims as to what they were going to do in those elections and it is to be believed that highly-placed Russians encouraged them not a little. It all ended up by the communists receiving something like seven per cent of the votes in Austria, and an estimated 18 per cent in Hungary.

Some observers believe that the communists now in the Austrian and Hungarian governments, or those who have replaced them at the time, will be dropped (since as soon as occupation troops are withdrawn by the Allies, the

decisions are not in the government, now by any popular choice, but only because their exclusion would anger Russia. The difference between Austria and Hungary on the one hand and Poland and Bulgaria (where the Communist claim strong adherents) on the other, is, observers think, that the elections in the first two countries were free while elections in the latter two countries were not. It seems that communist prestige falls off sharply wherever really free elections are held in Europe.

At the same time, there seems to be a growing belief here that as the result of the unanimous agreement between the so-called Big Three as a means of preserving peace in this country and England, too, to a lesser extent — is being identified with and blamed for Russian policies that are far divergent from our traditional thought.

An instance cited in this connection is the recent experience of United States Senators who have been striving to make it possible for the displaced and groups — including religious and charitable organizations — to mail and packages to Germany to aid in preventing starvation in that country.

Following a visit to the White House in the company of Senators Pat McCarran of Nevada, James Eastland of Mississippi and Robert W. La Follette of Wisconsin, Senator Kenneth S. Wherry of Nebraska said the committee had been informed that it was impossible to return mail and parcel post services even within the American-occupied zone of Germany because such a step requires "unanimous agreement" within the Allied Control Commission. This, Senator Wherry said, was an acknowledgment that the Russian government would not permit American relief in Germany.

"The American people should know the truth for all," Senator Wherry said, "that as the result of our Government's official policy, they being made the unwilling accomplices in the crime of mass starvation."

President Truman told his press conference the same day that the State Department is making an investigation and that as soon as an agreement has been reached by the occupation powers in Germany, the mail service from the outside world