



### As We See It

By DAN PATRICK

And now comes Congress to take a crack at the industrial strife which has produced the greatest domestic crisis in America since the dark days of 1933.

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 stepped work yesterday.

These labor disputes already have cut deep into the nation's reconversion 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 responsibilities 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 woes.

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 so 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 crack-down 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 levied, limitations on membership, number of paid-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

By Tom Rogers

Washington — EXCLUSIVE — The left-wing and the world of journalists in general will be buzzing in amazement in a few months. One, and possibly two, conversions are on the way. The story should be out by Spring.

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 been hit a critical political blow.

For example, Agriculture Secretary Anderson is using his influence to get higher prices for the meat packers, and John Anderson, Reconversion Director, worked for a boost in steel prices. Resisting their potent pressure are OPA Administrator Chester Bowles, Commerce Secretary Wallace, Labor Secretary Schwel-lenbach 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, Schwel-lenbach 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 discussion 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 Hannigan 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.

It was apparent a week or two ago, but the fact-finding and the

ability-to-pay ideas have split the CIO. Most of the old-time labor leaders within that organization are bitter against Walter Reuther, the UAW strike chief, for ever bringing up that subject. They fear that the ability-to-pay theory would be used against them to cut salaries and wages to many industries now and in the future. Fundamentally, it is something that labor leaders have shied away from for years.

An Army headache—this one in the international field—concerns the administration of Military Government in Germany. There is no clear answer in official Washington as to when and how the occupation administration is to be turned over by the Military to civilians. The only suggestion is that it may come in June. Meanwhile, Secretary of War has received a private report calling his attention to the fact that the Army is losing about 25% of its officers it trained especially for the military government duties, with no adequate replacements in sight, and the army is hiring qualified civilian aides to go to Germany in running into terrific difficulties.

Turn the eyes in your mind: Canada's family-allowance plan is worth noting in the present U. S. strike situation. Last July Canada began paying monthly allowances (\$5 to \$8) per child, to every family in the Dominion... as a matter of right, not charity. Instead of subsidizing farmers, unions, or industry, Canada has subsidized families. Even strikers would feel less pressure in a strike situation if they knew that something was coming in that would feed the children.

While the U. S. grants allowances off the income tax, Canada's program seems more to the point. We should consider something along that line, for the moral gangsters who support Mrs. Sanger and Mrs. Hepburn have gained ground since millions in the armed services learned more about birth prevention and the contraceptives that aid in national suicide.

To look over the news at breakfast is bad news if you overlook your wife.

## Religion Recognized By Yale Head

By J. J. GILBERT

Washington — The earliest plan by President Charles Seymour of Yale University for the establishment of a Department of Religion at that venerable institution of learning is of wide spread 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 at 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 heighten 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 this 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, that responsible American officials — in naming the delegation to represent the United States at the United Nations educational conference in London some weeks ago — chose 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 dangers 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 for the university to mean: "We must be free to teach what we think is right, free to do it in the way we think best, and free to admit students or exclude them, according to our own estimate of their capacity."

Observers of the European scene are beginning now to appreciate the courage demonstrated by Austrian and Hungarian voters in administering whopping defeats to communist candidates and to Soviet prestige in their recent elections. The communists had made loud and exaggerated claims as to what they were going to do in these 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 almost as soon as occupation troops are withdrawn by the Allies. The communists 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 Yugoslavia and Bulgaria (where the Communists claim strong adherents) on the other, is observers frankly say, 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 insistence upon "unanimous agreement" between the so-called Big Three as a means of preserving peace 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 25-division and groups—including religious and charitable organizations—to mail food packages to Germany as 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 M. La Follette of Wisconsin, Senator Kenneth S. Wherry of Nebraska said the committee had been informed that it was impossible to restore mail and parcel post services even within the American-occupied part of Germany because such a step requires "unanimous agreement" within the Allied Control Commission. The Senator considers an acknowledgment that the Russian government would not permit direct American relief in Germany.

"The American people should know once and for all," Senator Wherry said, "that as the result of our Government's official policy they are 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 a unanimous agreement has been reached by the occupation powers in Germany, "there will be mail service from the outside world by permission." (N.C.W.C. News Service)