



California AFL-CIO News

Published weekly by California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO,
995 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94103—Second Class
Postage Paid at San Francisco, Calif.—Subscription: \$3.50 a year

Executive Secretary-Treasurer

July 26, 1968

151

THOS. L. PITTS

Vol. 10—No. 30

Labor At the Legislature

From the Capitol Office
of the Executive Secretary

Assemblyman Frank Murphy's AB 253, dealing with mechanics' liens, was passed by the Senate with a 34 to 0 vote on July 20 and sent back to the Assembly for concurrence in amendments. It has now gone to the Governor for signature. This measure had the support of the California Labor Federation. It requires notice of cessation or completion of work to every claimant who has filed a verified claim for labor or material under a public contract.

* * *

Acknowledging opposition by "some segments" of labor, Assemblyman Walter Powers, Sacramento, led the Assembly floor fight for passage of SB 513, McCarthy, which will eliminate the detailed advertising of prevailing wage scales in notices to bidders on public works contracts. After a heated debate, the bill barely secured passage 41 to 24, with no votes to spare. It was sent back to the Senate where Assembly amendments were concurred in and the bill was then sent to the Governor's desk.

* * *

The Assembly Ways and Means Committee postponed hearings on Assemblyman Burton's AB 276 which provides that tips and gratuities shall be treated as wages for unemployment insurance purposes. This legislation is sponsored by the Federation.

Bill To Gut Pay Floor Held In Committee

Senator Lou Cusanovich Tuesday cast the "No" vote which held SB 1065 in the Senate Labor Committee. This is a

(Continued on Page 2)

Marks, Moscone Combine To Defeat Senate Bill 1272

Senator Milton Marks of San Francisco rose on the Senate floor on July 18 to summarize the opposition to SB 1272 by Bradley and then went on to provide able assistance to Senator George Moscone in defeating this anti-labor legislation after an extended battle.

Senator Moscone described SB 1272

when he said that it "benefits only those who do not belong to the labor movement."

The proposal would have drastically restricted access by wage earners to the State Labor Commissioner. It would have effected delays of from two to four months where more immediate relief was needed.

(Continued on Page 2)

IWC Restores Youth Pay Standards After Fed Protest

Hundreds of thousands of young California workers were the victors this week when the State Industrial Welfare Commission decided by a three to two vote to restore overtime pay to minors and to return the maximum age for girl students from 25 to 21.

The decision rescinds so-called "emergency action" taken by the Commission last May 10 that had eliminated a provision calling for overtime pay at time and one half to be paid to minors working more than 40 hours in a six day week and had extended the definition of student workers to apply to girls up to age 25 instead of just 21.

Thos. L. Pitts, Secretary-Treasurer of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, which had vigorously protested

(Continued on Page 4)

Who's Wooing Racist Vote?

While California's Governor Ronald Reagan was invading the deep South this week in an effort to woo votes away from Alabama's ex-governor George Wallace, Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey tackled the race issue head on.

"I would rather not be Presi-

(Continued on Page 4)

Road Show Team To Spread Word on Her-Ex Boycott

A "road show" team of trade unionists representing the 10 AFL-CIO unions involved in eight-month old strike-lockout at the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner is expected to hit the road shortly to carry the unions' justification for their boycott of Hearst corporation publications to every major city in the nation.

The roving "road show" team will appear at labor conventions and other meetings to appeal for support of the unions' consumer boycott of Hearst publications and of advertisers using the strikebreaker-produced Herald-Examiner, the Herald-Examiner Joint Strike-Lockout Council said.

(Continued on Page 4)

"What's the Matter With Kansas?"

"What's the matter with Kansas?" was the title of an editorial written by the late William Allen White in the Emporia (Kansas) Gazette that won national attention way back in 1896 but it could just as well apply today to a story just revealed by some U.S. Department of Commerce figures.

The Commerce Department

figures clearly suggest that what's the matter with Kansas today is that it's saddled with a so-called "right-to-work" law or, more objectively, a compulsory open-shop law.

Kansas was the only state to "go the other way" in 1958 when five other states — California, Ohio, Idaho, Washington, and Colorado — decisive-

ly rejected the idea of the compulsory open-shop.

In California, in fact, it was smothered by more than a million votes.

So what's happened to Kansas, the state whose citizens "bought" the blandishments of right-to-workers who claimed that new industry and prosperity would pour into Kansas if only its citizens would vote to deny its employers and workers the freedom to sign contracts containing union-shop clauses even if both the em-

(Continued on Page 3)

INST OF IND REL LIBRARY
UNIV OF CALIF
2521 CHANNING RM-110
BERKELEY CA 94720 JUL 30 1968

Validity of Authorization Cards Upheld

The National Labor Relations Board will continue to apply the rule that a worker who signs a clearly-worded authorization card in a union organizing campaign has signified his intention to designate

Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. On 'Unfair' List

The AFL-CIO Union Label and Service Trades Dept. has called on local unions, central bodies and union members to help the AFL-CIO Insurance Workers International Union win its strike against the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company by a consumer boycott.

The department put Metropolitan on the "unfair" list and noted that the strike issue has shifted from a dispute over pay to the company's demand for the right to fire any of the striking agents it chooses.

In addition to refusing to purchase insurance from Metropolitan, the department urged individuals and affiliates presently covered by Metropolitan policies to "earnestly consider a change of carriers."

Bill to Gut Pay Floor Held in Committee

(Continued from Page 1)

bad bill, dealing with minimum wage rates for women and minors. It was opposed in this and prior committee hearings by spokesmen of the California Labor Federation.

The bill was presented to the committee again by Dave Swoap, aide to the author Senator Way. It was frankly designed to short-circuit raises in the minimum pay scale for women and minors working in California. While its effects were not confined to agriculture, Swoap was backed up in his presentation by Ken Norris of the California Agricultural Council.

Senator Harmer was presiding and voted for Senator Deukmejian's motion to put the bill out "do pass." Senator Cusnovich cast a negative vote, depriving the motion of the necessary majority.

the union as his bargaining agent, NLRB members said in a 5-0 decision.

In a case involving Levi Strauss & Co., Tyler, Tex., and the Clothing Workers, the Board reviewed the rule it has followed for more than five years in cardcheck cases and spelled out the reasoning behind its orders to employers who destroy a union's majority by illegal means.

Noting that the validity of its cardcheck rulings "has been questioned by some courts and in some other quarters," the Board affirmed a trial examiner's findings that the union had in 1966 secured authorization cards from a majority of workers at the pants manufacturer's Tyler plant; that management later destroyed the union's majority by threats and promises and caused it to lose a 1967 election; and that the company should be ordered to recognize the ACWA and bargain with it.

The employer challenged the union's contention that it represented a majority of employees before the election. It claimed some of the cards should not be counted because

they were obtained "under the alleged misrepresentation that they would be used only for the purpose of obtaining an NLRB election."

Trial Examiner John P. von Rohr ruled after hearing testimony that the union had 87 valid authorization cards in a bargaining unit with 163 employees, and the Board agreed.

"The cards on their face," it said, "spell out in clear and unambiguous language an authorization for the union to represent the signer for collective bargaining."

The examiner held that in some instances the possibility of an election was mentioned but none of the employees was told that the cards would be used only for the purpose of getting an election.

The cards signed by the 87 employees were labeled "applications for membership" in ACWA and stated "I, the undersigned, hereby apply for membership in the Clothing Workers and do hereby appoint and authorize the officers thereof to represent and negotiate for me in all matters pertaining to wages, hours and other conditions of employment."

Marks, Moscone Combine To Beat Senate Bill 1272

(Continued from Page 1)

As spokesmen for Labor's position put it, the bill would deprive the "blue collar worker of a forum" by imposing a slow, cumbersome, harassing procedure in processing of wage claims.

Senator Marks put it squarely on the issue of "whether or not the purpose of the Labor Commissioner's office shall be carried out as intended." Marks said that the law now requires the Labor Commissioner to do what he is not now doing and that the purpose of SB 1272 was to sanction the recent departure from established practice for the previous 40 years, since creation of the office.

The vote was 17 for the bill, 19 against.

The vote last week was ac-

tually the second Senate defeat of SB 1272. It was refused passage 19 to 20 on July 1. Then, too, Senators Moscone and Marks led the battle against the bill, stating that it "deteriorates the concept of collective bargaining."

At that time, Senator Alfred Song characterized it as "unnecessary and unjust." He also pointed out that an identical bill was defeated in the Senate Labor Committee last year, that it was introduced on the last day for unrestricted presentation of bills and that there was "no real need for this particular bill."

After the defeat on the first, Senator Bradley secured reconsideration and SB 1272 "rode the file" for two weeks before he brought it up in the Senate for its final defeat.

Detroit Joins Cities Backing Farm Workers

Public indignation began to snowball nationally this week against California grape growers who refused to grant their workers "union recognition, a living wage and decent living conditions."

Detroit's Mayor Jerome Cavanaugh announced last Thursday (July 18) that Detroit city institutions would follow the lead of New York and not buy grapes from California growers who refused to recognize the AFL-CIO's United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

Pointing out that people in New York and Boston have already "responded impressively" to the union's boycott appeals, Mayor Cavanaugh said:

"I urge the citizens of this community to do the same."

Elimination of Detroit city institutions alone means the loss of a potential sale of three tons of California grapes, it was reported.

But it seemed apparent in the minds of mounting millions of consumers across the nation that the denial of decent wages, working conditions and union recognition to California's long exploited farm workers far outweighed the California grape growers' loss.

Both the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit and the Episcopal Diocese of Michigan also urged support for the boycott. The most Reverend Walter Schoenherr, Auxiliary Bishop of the Detroit Archdiocese said:

"We ask that the citizens of Michigan refrain from eating California table grapes, that our stores remove them from our shelves until the vine workers obtain union recognition, a living wage and decent living conditions."

In California, the 500,000-member Northern California Council of Churches urged its members not to buy table grapes picked by non-union farm workers.

"So long as employers refuse to recognize and bargain with an organization of their workers, they must accept primary responsibility for the pain and distress of resultant strikes and boycotts," the Council declared.

What's the Matter With Kansas?

(Continued from Page 1)

ployer and a majority of the workers thought such a clause was in their mutual best interests.

Well, one of the clearest measures of a state's economic health is its per capita income.

And according to the survey of Current Business published by the Department of Commerce in April, 1968, the per capita income in Kansas in 1967 had dropped to \$128 below the national average.

In 1958 it was \$5 above the national average.

Kansans Lose \$133

In short, since its adoption of the so-called "right-to-work" law, Kansas has suffered a loss in per capita income totaling \$133.

But that's just one state. Could it be an exception?

Well, suppose you take the six RTW states that were above the national average in per capita income when they saddled themselves with this deceptively labeled legislation, what's happened to them?

Of these six states — Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, South Dakota and Wyoming — five are now below the national average.

And even Nevada, the only one still above the national average has lost ground, failing to keep up with the national average increase.

Exception Explained

Moreover, Nevada IS something of an exception because of its extensive gambling industry and its small population of less than half a million people. In fact, it's the nation's third smallest state in terms of population, ranking 48th.

The Commerce Department figures also provide some other interesting comparisons. All of the 18 states and the District of Columbia that are above the \$3,137 national average in per capita income are non-RTW states with the exception of Nevada. These states are Con-

Test of Progress

"The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little." — Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

necticut, New York, Illinois, Delaware, California, Alaska, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Washington, Maryland, Michigan, Hawaii, Indiana, Rhode Island, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania.

Among these states, California ranks 6th with a per capita income of \$3,660. It is topped by the District of Columbia, \$4,268; Connecticut, \$3,865; New York, \$3,726; Illinois, \$3,725; and Delaware, \$3,700.

But what's the picture among the 19 states at the bottom of the list, those with the lowest per capita income?

The answer is that 12 of the 19 states with the lowest per capita income are "right-to-work" states.

And the four states in the nation with the lowest per capita income — South Carolina — \$2,167; George Wallace's Alabama, \$2,166; Arkansas, \$2,090; and Mississippi, \$1,895 — are all so-called "right-to-work" states.

Falling Behind

Moreover, if you compare RTW states with non-RTW states you'll find that RTW states have fallen progressively farther and farther behind.

In 1960 RTW states were \$455 below the average while non-RTW states were \$180 above.

In 1966 RTW states were \$521 below the U.S. average but non-RTW states had risen to \$208 above.

And just last year, the 19 RTW states had fallen to \$557 below the U. S. average while non-RTW states had climbed to \$222 above.

In summary, between 1950 and 1967 per capita personal income in RTW states has dropped from \$467 below non-RTW states to \$779 below non-RTW states.

False Claim Bared

The real significance of these figures, however, is that they reflect what has actually happened to per capita income in states that have adopted "right-to-work" laws since they adopted them. In short, the figures dramatically expose the falsity of the "right-to-workers" claims.

The RTW promoters are, for the most part, kept alive by a small, ignorant segment of the business community that still

apparently refuses to recognize that "it takes money to make money;" that decent wages and working conditions for employees mean more consumer purchasing power for their own products and services.

It seems kind of sad, if not incredible, that some businessmen are so ignorant of the real opportunities and potential of our economic system that they still apparently think it's necessary to attempt to rob the labor of others to make a profit.

Of course, the small band of RTW promoters don't mind this ignorance at all. In fact, they apparently manage to wangle a pretty posh life out of it with their seemingly innocuous slogan that "workers should have a right, but not be obliged, to join a union."

Deceptive Slogan

To many individuals among the more than 60 percent of the nation's total labor force that are outside of the trade union movement, this slogan sounds patently reasonable. But, like many slogans, it is deceptive. It glosses over the fact that, to exist, unions must enjoy the support of a majority, generally an overwhelming majority of the workers whose wages and working conditions they seek to protect and improve.

And it ignores the fact that unions are based on the same sturdy principles that have served as the bedrock for our nation—majority rule with minority rights.

But, even though they disavow it, the sly RTW promoters' principle aim is to destroy unions. So they champion the idea that workers should be free to enjoy all the benefits and services a union may provide for them without being obliged to pay their fair share of the cost of winning such benefits and services.

A Comparison

Extended to the community level, this is substantially parallel to claiming that a homeowner should be free to refuse to pay a sidewalk or sewer district assessment even though the overwhelming majority of voters in his district vote for it, and his own property is enhanced by it.

At rock bottom, the RTW slogan boils down to a license for anarchy and that's why

Office Workers' Union Rolls Rise 21% in 3 Years

The AFL-CIO Office and Professional Employees International Union has chalked up a 21 percent membership growth in the past three years.

That was part of the report made to delegates to the union's recent six day convention in Philadelphia by international union president Howard Coughlin.

Coughlin also reported on recent breakthrough successes in unionizing bank employees in three large banks in the United States and Canada — one in Montreal and two others in New Jersey.

AFL-CIO President George Meany, one of the principal speakers at the convention, told the delegates that he "had not lost faith in America because of some individuals with warped minds." Meany also suggested that we should "not lose faith in college kids just because we see some behavior that annoys us."

Opportunities for the white collar union's growth were underscored by Undersecretary of Labor James Reynolds who pointed out that professional jobs will increase by 45 percent by 1975.

In the course of the convention Coughlin called for a four-day work week as one means of maintaining full employment and a healthy economy after "the end of hostilities in South Viet Nam."

trade unionists and so many enlightened employers oppose so-called "right to work" laws.

Trade unionists don't want to be told by the government either to have union security or not to have union security and they don't want the employer to be dictated to by the federal or state government on that issue either.

Trade unionists just want both the employer and the union to have freedom of choice — freedom to agree within our democratic traditions on the most sensible working rules for the plant in which they have a common working interest.

It's as simple as that.

IWC Restores Youth Pay Standards

(Continued from Page 1)

the Commission's "emergency actions," said the IWC's decision last Tuesday was "the only proper step the Commission could take to rectify a hasty and ill-considered emergency action."

"The Commission majority is to be commended for correcting what would otherwise have been a long step backward in California's minimum wage standards," he said.

Both decisions become effective Sept. 24, 1968.

The State AFL-CIO had submitted a statement to the Commission on July 1 protesting the emergency actions of May 10 that weakened the wage orders applying to 11 of the 14 industrial groupings over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

The Federation also had a representative testify at the public hearing in San Francisco Tuesday prior to the Commission's decision.

Asserting that there was "no adequate justification" for weakening the wage orders in these two respects, the Federation and other trade union spokesmen pointed out that if these emergency actions were made permanent "adult women would be penalized because an employer would find it advantageous to employ minors on the sixth day in a week at

straight time rather than adults at time and one half.

"In other words, employers would find it profitable to substitute minors for adult women workers because of the need to pay overtime to women after 40 hours. This obviously is unfair," the Federation had pointed out.

In adopting its "emergency action" on May 10, the IWC had maintained it was doing so in the interests of increasing vacation-time job opportunities for youth.

While agreeing that such a goal was desirable, the State AFL-CIO emphasized that the Commission's emergency action has had "the opposite effect" and cited unemployment figures to prove the point.

If the IWC had adopted its emergency action on a permanent basis, Pitts explained, girl student workers would have been obliged to work for only \$1.35 an hour until age 25 instead of 21 and minors would have been required to work for up to 48 hours a week without receiving overtime pay for work in excess of 40 hours, the generally accepted national standard workweek.

Moreover, if the emergency action had been made permanent, it would also have had a "severely adverse effect on other California workers whose pay scale is close to the \$1.65 state minimum for adult

women," he added.

In other action, the IWC ordered creation of a Wage Board panel so that a new wage order, the Commission's 15th, could be drawn up to protect household domestic workers.

The Commission had voted to establish a wage order for domestics last September but it thus far had failed to order the Division of Industrial Welfare to develop a list of prospective wage board appointees. It did so Tuesday. The list is to be submitted to the Commission by October 1, 1968. Shortly thereafter the Commission is expected to appoint the Wage Board.

At the Los Angeles hearing on Monday, representatives of the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, local unions and youth groups had also expressed vigorous opposition to the Commission's so-called "emergency" actions.

IWC members voting to restore the minimum wage standards for youth were: J. J. Rodriguez, Commission Chairman; Dorothy Colton, the public member; and Ruth E. Compagnon. Opposed were Theodore J. Todd and Stanton Elliott, the two employer representatives on the Commission.

In restoring the maximum age for student workers to 21 from 25, the Commission re-adopted the language prevailing earlier in the year.

Road Show To Aid Her-Ex Boycott

(Continued from Page 1)

Armed with the boycott message in both film and pamphlet form, the team plans to picket branches of Herald-Examiner national advertisers to urge shoppers to stop subsidizing Hearst's union busting activities in Los Angeles where publisher George R. Hearst, Jr., has adamantly insisted that strikebreakers be given super-seniority over strikers in any contract negotiated.

Just last week, chief negotiator Robert Rupert, an international representative of the Newspaper Guild, described the boycott as the unions' most effective weapon at the present time and noted that the Herald-Examiner, once the largest evening daily in the nation, was clearly feeling the pinch.

He said the paper's advertising lineage for the month of May was more than 731,000 less than in May 1967 and that total losses since January 1 exceed five million lines or more than \$7.5 million in advertising revenues alone.

In contrast, other Southern California newspapers as well as most papers throughout the nation were showing a strong upward trend in advertising lineage, he said.

The "road show" team will also appeal for more financial aid.

Who's Wooing the Racist Vote in '68 Presidential Race?

(Continued from Page 1)

dent of the United States — I would rather not be nominated as a candidate for President — than to have to depend on a racist vote to get the nomination," Humphrey declared at a news conference at La Guardia Airport in New York.

Another Tour

Reagan, who took off on a political speaking tour last Friday that was scheduled to take him to Texas, Arkansas, Virginia, Maryland, Alabama and Ohio even though the California legislature is now in the critical closing days of its 1968 session, conceded that the Republican party is worried over the Wallace movement.

All but abandoning his

claim of being just a "favorite son," Reagan said he was making the trip because "very frankly, they asked me because of the strength of Governor Wallace."

In the past Reagan had said Wallace was a Democratic party problem, not a Republican one, but at a recent news conference he denied ever feeling that Wallace was of no concern to the GOP.

"I never have thought that," he said. "He's going to change the balance very possibly."

But at his La Guardia Airport news conference, Humphrey took a decidedly different view:

"He (Wallace) won't hold it (the balance of power) as far

as I'm concerned. Let me make this crystal clear: No deal with Governor Wallace as far as Hubert Humphrey is concerned. No deals, even if it—the presidential selection — goes to the House of Representatives."

Nixon Tiptoes

Meanwhile, the Republican party's front-running candidate Richard M. Nixon was tiptoeing through California disavowing any intent to raid the California GOP delegation pledged to Reagan.

Although Nixon held a reception for the delegates in Los Angeles this week, the former vice president explained:

"My conversations with them will not concern how they will vote at the convention. I don't

want to do anything which would cause a fight within the delegation."

In contrast to Reagan, who indicated approval of some of Wallace's views at his press conference last week and who, despite direct questions, failed to explain how his views differed from Wallace's, Nixon obliquely repudiated Wallace, saying:

"I would not say the former Alabama governor's speeches represent any views similar to mine."

Does this rundown on the stands of three presidential candidates leave any doubt as to who is forthright and direct and who is seeking to curry the racist vote?