THE MYSTERIOUS WAY

BY SAMUEL W. TAYLOR

ILLUSTRATED BY EARL BLOSSOM

Milo skidded to a stop. "Git here in time?" he yelled. "A madman! Good heavens, what a ride!" Mrs. Toolson exclaimed

CONTINUING THE STORY OF A REMARKABLE COURTSHIP

The Story:

JACKSON WHITETOP really had his hands full. His grandfather, old MORONI SKINNER, had come down from heaven and told him to marry KATIE JENSEN, the BISHOP'S pretty daughter. But Katie was all set to marry HENRY BROWN, the storekeeper and sheep rancher who had taken over Jackson's sheep during the war and had been quietly defrauding him ever since; and when Jackson announced that he was going to marry her, everyone laughed at him—except old MILO FERGUSON, an apostate who was Henry's helper in the store, to whom Moroni had also appeared. Katie's mother, BERYL JENSEN, tricked the bishop into believing he had received a heavenly message telling him Jackson couldn't marry Katie unless he settled the Trouble, an old feud between the inhabitants of the valley, led by YOUNG MERRILL LITTLEWALL and REED CARTER, which centered around the building of a new meetinghouse.

Then NEPHI SMITH'S daughter, ANITA, intimated that Jackson was responsible for her illegitimate child, and Nephi (who had no idea the real culprit was Henry) demanded a wedding. The next morning NED HOLT, Henry's unwilling partner in crime, tried to give Jackson a lot of money—to clear his conscience so he could marry BEULAH HESS. Jackson refused the money but accepted Holt's recipe for "coffee." Milo disappeared from the valley. Then Jackson discovered a packet containing $25,000 on his kitchen shelf, and Henry found that his own secret cache had been looted. Young Merrill Littlewall, Reed Carter and SID WORTH, hoping to find hidden treasure,

money.

"Sure we lost it. I kept a list of the serial numbers." The little man produced the list.

Jackson went inside and checked the list against half a dozen bills. Funniest thing he ever had happen to him. The money mysteriously appearing, Henry making out as if it was his, but refusing to take it, and now these two strangers showing up to identify it. He figured there was something about it all he didn't understand. He took the money out and gave it to the stranger. "Here you go. I'm sure glad to get rid of this stuff."

The little man's eyes narrowed suspiciously. He'd expected at least an argument. This local yokel was either plenty dumb or plenty deep. "Thanks, friend. You're an honest man."

"I don't want what ain't mine, is all. How'd the stuff get in my place in the first place, is what I can't figure out."

A deep one, the little man concluded: a deep one playing dumb. Couldn't come out and admit, of

(Continued on page 48)

TOWARD PEACE IN LABOR

BY ROBERT A. TAFT

U. S. SENATOR FROM OHIO

The coauthor of the much disputed Labor-Management Relations Act reports on its first few months of operation. He points out that strikes already have been reduced and that the act has helped promote justice between employer and employee

LAST September an enterprising new company purchased a few LST ships from the government. It planned to carry loaded truck trailers from New York City to Albany. Since up to 50 trailers might be loaded on an LST, the new company was able to make a very attractive proposition to New York shippers. It meant a saving on gasoline, wear and tear on their trucks and the time of 50 drivers. The shippers readily took advantage of it.

It looked like a profitable business until the Teamsters Union demanded that the shippers pay its members "stand-by time" for the full time it took to ship the trailers to their destination. There would be no saving to the shippers if they had to pay both the new company and the teamsters for carrying their freight to Albany. The ships lay idle and the Trailership Company found itself stopped before it had started.

The Longshoremen's Union had counted on the new Trailership venture to supply work for some of its members. It promptly struck the port of Albany, refusing to permit any ship in that port to be moved. The object of the strike was to force the shippers to use the new trailerships. Large quantities of perishable food, much of which was destined for European consumption, could not be moved.

The shippers immediately filed charges with the National Labor Relations Board alleging a secondary boycott on the part of the longshoremen and a feather-bedding practice on the part of the teamsters. The board first proceeded against the longshoremen and at once obtained a restraining order in the federal district court. The strike was over and the port opened the following day. The board then prepared its complaint against the teamsters. That union, however, realizing that the board meant business, rescinded its demand for "stand-in pay." The converted LST ships started to haul trailers from New York City to Albany.

Prior to June 22, 1947, no legal remedy existed for the shippers, the Trailership Company, or any other business confronted with similar difficulties. On that date the Labor-Management Relations Act was passed over President Truman's veto. Perhaps the most carefully drawn of any of its provisions were those outlawing the secondary boycott. This case is by no means an isolated instance of the operation of the new law.

In Pennsylvania, the Rural Motor Express Company operated as a connecting carrier between two large interstate terminals. This small company's employees refused to join a union of truck drivers. The union then resorted to the tactic used so successfully before passage of the new law. The drivers at the connecting terminals refused to handle the goods carried by Rural Motor Express.

The shippers had to divert their shipments by a longer route, and Rural Motor Express had no business. It filed a charge with NLRB. The drivers' union did not wait for the issuance of a formal complaint against it.

The boycott was stopped and it agreed in writing not to reinstitute it. Rural Motor Express is again operating as a connecting carrier.

Teamsters Picket Hatters

In New York City during the October strike at American Railway Express, a group of hat manufacturers hired independent truckers to haul their products to terminals outside New York City for shipment to their customers. The Teamsters Union sent pickets into the hatters' district of the city, who "suggested" to the independent truckers that they not load the hatters' products. The hatters' association filed charges with NLRB and instructed their lawyers to file a suit for damages under another section of the new law. The NLRB sent investigators into the district, and the pickets were removed before nightfall.

Are unions calling off their secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes because of possible court injunctions or cease and desist orders obtained by NLRB, or because the new law gives the injured party a right to sue and collect damages out of union treasuries grown rich by wartime dues? The unions aren't saying, but neither remedy would exist but for the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

Hundreds of examples of such boycotts were presented to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Each of them imposed unjust hardships on innocent third parties. No witness appeared before our committee to defend this racketeering practice. Perhaps the best proof of the act's effectiveness is in the infrequency of such disputes in the news today. Where they have occurred, the filing of a charge with the NLRB, and the commencement of its investigations, has usually resulted in their elimination.

The Taft-Hartley law was passed over the President's veto by a vote of 431 to 83 in the House of Representatives, and 68 to 25 in the Senate. Not only did practically all the Republicans vote for the law, but more than a majority of the Democrats in Congress voted to override the veto of the Democratic President. This public opinion has been reflected in the attitude of many labor union members. I have countless letters from them, and many of them have come to see me personally to say that they approve the law because it protects them against the arbitrary actions and orders of those who control the unions.

Of course, after the bill was passed, there were plenty of protests, as witness these samples in my mail: "Today (May 13, 1947, the day the bill first passed the Senate) is just as much an infamy as Pearl Harbor."

"I am 100 per cent against your slave labor bill."

The authors of the act were accused of attempting "to take away from workers" all the gains and rights they have won in the last 10 or 12 years.

But all labor letters were not hostile when the bill was passed, and today I hear many commendations. For example: "The majority of the rank and file of labor indorses the Taft-Hartley Act . . ." The law is described in another letter as "a guardian of the basic rights of every American." In personal conversation union men have spoken of the new law to me as Labor's Bill of Rights. And so on.

The greater part of the new law's provisions have only been in effect since August 22d, but it is already possible to assess their value. Hardly a day goes by without proving how wrong the law's opponents were in their dire predictions as to its effect. In order that the Congress might be kept informed on the day-to-day operation of the new law, we created a Study Committee and charged it with the responsibility of watching its administration. As a member of that committee, I have been able to observe how the new law has been meeting its objectives.

Public Is Better Protected

I think it is fair to say that nearly all of the many amendments made to existing labor laws by the new act have worked satisfactorily to promote justice between employers and employees and between labor union leaders and their members. At the same time greater protection has been given to the public, and the number of strikes has decreased.

The committee has requested anyone who feels aggrieved to appear before it, state the case and suggest amendments, but at this time we see no reason for recommending amendments to the 1948 session.

The Wagner Act made it easy for employees to obtain representation by a union. They merely voted for the union at a government-conducted election. If the union proved unsatisfactory, however, the only way for the employees to get rid of it was to vote in another union. The NLRB refused to recognize a petition for "no" union. We were assured by the union leaders that it was only the employers who ever wanted to discharge the union as bargaining agent, but we nevertheless provided that when 30 per cent of the employees informed the NLRB that they no longer desired the union to represent them, an election would be held.

Apparently the union leaders were wrong. Statistical releases by NLRB at the end of the first 60 days of operation under the new statute disclosed that 18 per cent of the petitions for elections were filed by employees to obtain decertification of the union that had been representing them.

After twice reversing itself on the issue, the NLRB on December 6, 1945, ordered the Packard Motor Car Company to bargain with a union of its

(Continued on page 38)