



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

THOS. L. PITTS  151
Executive Secretary-Treasurer

Nov. 29, 1969
Vol. 11—No. 48

Yule Shopping? Insist on Seeing The Union Label

With the approach of the Christmas season every trade union member is being urged to ponder the impact of his purchasing power on the economy and his fellow workers by the AFL-CIO Union Label and Service Trades Department.

The colorful and decorative items involved in the Christmas season—the artificial tree, lights, bells, bulbs, etc.—are

(Continued on Page 3)

Senate Rejects Haynsworth by Vote of 55 to 45

For the first time in 39 years and only the 10th time in the nation's history, the United States Senate rejected a Presidential nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court when it turned thumbs down on Federal Judge Clement F. Haynsworth of South Carolina by a decisive 55 to 45 vote last Friday.

The Senate vote culminated an AFL-CIO-sparked drive to bar the appointment on grounds that Haynsworth's record was anti-worker, anti-civil rights and showed that the judge had repeatedly displayed a lack of sensitivity to judicial ethics by failing to disqualify himself from cases in which he had a direct or indirect personal financial interest.

More votes were cast against

(Continued on Page 2)

Here's wishing You
A Very
**HAPPY
THANKSGIVING**

Fed Urges U. S. Safety Law To Protect All Workers

Strong support for minimum federal standards to protect the health and safety of workers on the job was voiced by the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, last weekend at a House subcommittee hearing in San Francisco.

Citing the fact that more U.S. workers are killed on the job each year than GIs on the battlefields in Vietnam, the State AFL-CIO testified in support of the proposed Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1969 as embodied in HR 3809 and S.2193 introduced by Rep. James G. O'Hara (D-Mich.) and Sen. Harrison A. Williams, Jr. (D-N.J.) respectively.

The State AFL-CIO's position, presented in behalf of Thos. L.

Pitts, the Federation's secretary-treasurer, particularly stressed the need to include farm workers and federal and

state employees under the legislation.

Pitts' statement noted that
(Continued on Page 4)

Reality of Pesticide Peril Bared at Hearing in S.F.

Despite all the recent evidence of the threat posed by the continued use of pesticides to mankind's entire environment, let alone their direct threat to the health and safety of farm workers forced to work in pesticide-painted fields, California's top grower spokesmen continually attempt to claim that this is just a phony scare

issue raised by the AFL-CIO United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

But the callousness — if not inhumanity — of the growers' position was exposed last Saturday when a Tulare County pediatrician told a House subcommittee that undetected pesticide poisoning may be wide-

(Continued on Page 4)

Nationwide GE Boycott Slated to Start Today

A nationwide boycott of General Electric products is scheduled to begin today, barring a last minute settlement of the strike involving 147,000 trade unionists throughout the country.

Following a meeting of the AFL-CIO Coordinated Bargaining Committee for G.E. last Monday, AFL-CIO President George Meany said:

"It is with great reluctance but complete determination

that we announce that a consumer boycott will begin next Friday morning against all

(Continued on Page 3)

Court Ruling Points Up Roadblock to Union Organizing Efforts

Non-union members of the general public often wonder why some unions aren't stronger and aren't doing more for their members and for society at large.

What they don't recognize is the extent to which many em-

ployers, particularly large corporations, can throw roadblocks in the path of unions merely seeking to contact their employees to present the union's side of the case.

A case in point was at issue when the U.S. Supreme Court

Senate Unit OKs 'Poverty Plan for Rich' Publishers

An AFL-CIO-opposed bill to give newspaper publishers special privileges to fix prices and pool profits through joint operations was approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee by an 8 to 4 vote and sent to the Senate floor early this month.

The measure, which was re-

(Continued on Page 2)

recently declined to review a lower court order requiring the Prudential Insurance Company of America to give the AFL-CIO Insurance Workers International Union an up-to-date list of the names and addresses of its 17,000 district agents.

By its action, the nation's highest court let stand a 2nd U.S. Court of Appeals ruling that had upheld the National Labor Relations Board's find-

(Continued on Page 3)

INST OF IND REL
UNIV OF CALIF
RELATIONS LIBRARY

Senate Unit OKs 'Poverty Plan for Rich' Publishers

(Continued from Page 1)

cently described by Senator Philip A. Hart (D-Mich.) as "a poverty program for the rich," would give newspaper publishers broad special exemptions from the nation's anti-trust laws.

It is being pushed by some of the nation's wealthier newspaper publishers in an effort to get around a U.S. Supreme Court decision last March that invalidated a joint operating agreement existing between newspapers in Tucson, Ariz.

The nation's high court held that the Tucson publishers' arrangement, which involved price fixing and profit pooling, was in violation of the nation's anti-trust laws.

Earlier this year, the California Labor Federation urged California's congressmen not to support the measure, euphemistically titled the "Newspaper Preservation Act," on grounds that it would:

- License the monopolization of news and advertising in areas all over the country.

- Result in vastly increased advertising rates for consumers.

- Diminish competition for news coverage.

- Increase the growing concentration of the daily press in the hands of fewer and fewer publishers.

- And "diminish the forum available in this country for the competition of ideas and opinion vital to the preservation of our democratic institution."

In hearings on the measure last month, U.S. Assistant Attorney General Richard W. McLaren said that the bill would create a dangerous precedent under the anti-trust laws for other industries and that it would grant immunity from the most hard-core type of violations of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act.

McLaren stressed the fact that the Justice Department's objections were directed principally at the price-fixing and profit-pooling aspects of the bill.

At the same time, however, McLaren was obliged to explain that he was not speaking

Senate Bars Haynsworth By a Vote of 55 to 45

(Continued from Page 1)

Haynsworth Friday than in any of the nine previous cases in which a Presidential nominee was rejected and the margin by which Haynsworth was denied confirmation — 10 votes — was also the largest in Supreme Court history.

California's Senator Alan Cranston voted with the majority against Haynsworth's confirmation. Senator George Murphy voted for confirmation.

Following the vote culminating the three-month long battle over confirmation, President Nixon issued a statement saying he deeply regretted the Senate action and believed that "a majority of the people in the nation felt the same way."

What validity the President's belief about the feelings of the majority of the nation's citizens were on the Haynsworth issue may be questionable, but the stark fact that 40 percent of the President's own party members in the Senate — 17 out of 42 Senate Republicans — could not bring themselves to support Nixon's nominee represents a major victory for the AFL-CIO and other labor and civil rights groups that spearheaded the fight to bar Haynsworth's appointment.

AFL-CIO President George Meany had contacted the President last summer prior to public announcement of Haynsworth's nomination to urge him not to nominate Haynsworth. But the President ignored Meany's suggestion as well as the information Meany presented at that time which questioned Haynsworth's suitability for the nation's highest court.

A number of reports have suggested that Nixon stuck by his Haynsworth appointment largely at the insistence of U.S.

for the Nixon Administration. He said that the President had allowed the Justice Department to testify on the issue because "the President understood that the department had a position on the basis of law."

The Nixon Administration's position in favor of the bill was presented by spokesmen for the Commerce Department, often the champion of big business interests.

Attorney General John N. Mitchell in order to carry out campaign promises to Nixon's supporters in the South to "restore the proper balance" to the Supreme Court.

Following the Senate vote, Mitchell said that Haynsworth's defeat was a "reflection of the failure of some in the Senate to recognize the President's constitutional prerogatives."

Mitchell's comment seems to ignore the fact that it is the Senate's prerogative and duty to confirm or deny Presidential nominees for the U.S. Supreme Court.

In commenting on the vote, Senator Cranston suggested indirectly that Mitchell, rather than the nation's Senators opposed to Haynsworth, was responsible for Haynsworth's rejection.

Cranston said that the President's staff did not present Nixon with a true picture of his nominee.

"If his staff, in looking into Judge Haynsworth's record had unearthed the facts we discovered in the Senate, I'm sure President Nixon never would have submitted his name."

Of the 45 U.S. Senators voting to confirm Haynsworth, 19 were Democrats and 26 Republicans but 18 of the Democrats were Southern Democrats. The sole exception was Senator Mike Gravel (D-Alaska).

The last time the Senate refused confirmation of a Supreme Court nominee was on April 7, 1930 when it rejected the name of Circuit Court Judge John J. Barker of North Carolina by a vote of 41 to 39.

Barker was opposed by organized labor because of opinions upholding court injunctions against strikers.

Truly Brothers

"To see the earth as it truly is, small and blue and beautiful in that eternal silence where it floats, is to see ourselves as riders on the earth together, brothers on that bright loveliness in the eternal cold — brothers who know now they are truly brothers." — Archibald MacLeish.

New Zealand Labor Backs Grape Boycott

More international support for the farm worker's struggle for union recognition and full collective bargaining rights was voiced recently when the New Zealand Federation of Labor called on all of its members to boycott California table grapes.

Tom Skinner, President of the New Zealand Federation which includes most of the country's trade unions, noted late last month that the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions has called for an international boycott of California table grapes to support California farm workers who have been on strike in California vineyards since September 1965 in an effort to win decent wages and working conditions.

Similar action has been taken by labor organizations in a number of other countries including Canada, Great Britain, and Sweden.

MacPherson Heads Bargaining Board

James L. MacPherson has been designated Executive Director of the newly-established Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Commission by U.S. Secretary of Labor George B. Shultz.

MacPherson, 45, will take a leave of absence from his post as regional director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to head the Washington staff of the commission.

The commission was set up by an Executive Order issued by President Nixon several weeks ago to develop voluntary procedures to meet manpower, collective bargaining, and other problems of the construction industry.

Shultz serves as chairman of the commission, which is composed of an equal number of members representing the public, the construction industry and building trades unions.

MacPherson once served as Industrial Relations analyst for the regional Wage Stabilization Board in Seattle.

Ruling Points Up Roadblock to Organizing

(Continued from Page 1)

ing that the list is relevant and that bulletin board communications between the union and the company's agents is inadequate.

The appellate court's majority opinion had pointed out that if the union followed the company's reasoning, it would have to station at least one representative at each of Prudential's 897 offices in 34 states to distribute union messages by hand.

The company had repeatedly refused the union's request for names and addresses of agents who were not union members.

Despite this roadblock thrown up by Prudential management to attempt to deny their employees an opportunity to hear the union's side of the case, Prudential union members recently ratified a new three-year contract with the company that covers 9,000 union members as well as 8,000 agents who "ride free" without paying dues.

Freeriders may think they're getting something for nothing, but the truth is they're fooling themselves. This is because, by failing to carry their fair share of the cost of the union, they undermine the union's potential capabilities to win better wages and fringe benefits for themselves and their fellow workers.

Labor Costs Amount to Only 16% of Price of New House

Construction labor costs on a \$21,200 three-bedroom house in the Milwaukee area run about \$3,444 — or 16 percent of the total, a study by the Milwaukee Building & Construction Trades Council revealed.

The study was conducted in cooperation with a Milwaukee building contractor in an effort to establish the facts on construction costs and refute charges that labor costs are responsible for the high price of housing, the council said.

John Zancanaro, president of the trades council, said "the rising cost of materials, the soaring cost of land and particularly exorbitant interest

Nationwide GE Boycott Slated to Start Today

(Continued from Page 1)

General Electric products unless a satisfactory settlement of the strike has been reached by that time.

"American workers don't like to boycott. They like to produce and purchase.

"So we have waited in the vain hope that General Electric would bargain in good faith. The company still has time to negotiate in the American tradition of fair play.

NO OTHER RECOURSE

"But if GE continues its arrogant take-it-or-leave-it attitude we will have no recourse but to urge customers throughout the country to refuse to buy any products that bear a GE label.

"In its full-page ads, G.E. says it deplures boycotts. Of course, G.E. also advertises that it opposes inflation at the very time it is raising prices, so we never know when a G.E. ad is telling the truth.

"If it means what it says, G.E. can avert this boycott. Because if the boycott takes place, it will be because G.E. forced it, just as G.E. forced its workers to strike."

Meany said instructions on the proper techniques for consumer picketing would be mailed to all AFL-CIO affiliates and that they would be called on to mobilize their senior citizen organizations to

help.

He said the boycott, which will include Hotpoint Products, has been promised the "complete cooperation" of the Union Label and Service Trades Department as well as the AFL-CIO Women's Auxiliaries and its local affiliates.

"We intend to put informational picket lines in front of consumer outlets featuring G.E. products, to handbill customers in shopping centers, to use billboards and other media to urge union members, their families, friends and neighbors to refuse to buy G.E. products," Meany said.

OTHER ACTIONS

AFL-CIO State and City leaders will be asked to meet with government purchasing agents in their localities to urge them to immediately halt the purchase of any G.E. products "from a lightbulb to a generator until G.E. reaches a satisfactory settlement with its workers," he said.

In re-emphasizing the union's desire to win a prompt resolution of the dispute, Meany declared:

"We hope there will be an immediate end to the strike so that there will be no necessity of a boycott.

"But if G.E. refuses, then we will boycott everything that bears a G.E. label every place in this country for as long as it takes to get a contract."

Yule Shopping? Insist on Seeing The Union Label

(Continued from Page 1)

all available as union made products. But they are also made by cheaper labor overseas and imported and sold in this country.

So one of the key questions becomes:

Will a union member buy the cheap imported products this Christmas only to eliminate the job of a fellow union member by next Christmas?

The average worker's Christmas shopping list is full of items such as radios, TV's, shoes, sweaters, suits, ties, wagons, dolls, etc., which are all available as the products of union firms in the United States. The same items are also made by cheap labor abroad, imported and sold here.

The Union Label and Service Trades Department points out that: "This is America and we do have a choice, the right to buy or not to buy. We can select the cheap import and save pennies now but if we do we are liable to watch all the benefits in wage scales and working conditions wither away.

And that's why all trade unionists are urged to insist on finding the union label on the Christmas gifts they buy this year.

State's Population Put at 19,856,000

California's population climbed by only 1.5 percent last year to total 19,856,000, according to State Finance Department estimates released recently.

The state's population is expected to top the 20 million mark between January and April next year. The rate of the state's growth attributed to new residents from other states dipped to 105,000 for the last fiscal year, the lowest level since 1948.

Look for the Label

To be sure you're getting the finest products and services, look for the union label.

Where The Poor Live

Two-thirds of all poor live outside the central cities of metropolitan areas, according to "Changes in Urban America," a report issued by the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Fed Urges U.S. Safety Law to Protect All Workers

(Continued from Page 1)

last year the farm workers' national death rate was 65 per 100,000 workers while the rate in American manufacturing was only 9 per 100,000 workers.

"Thus, a farm worker's chances of being killed on the job were seven times greater than those of the factory worker," it noted.

In digging toward the root cause of this disparity, the Federation noted that although California became the first state to adopt special safety orders for farm workers in 1961, the law's enforcement has been inadequate.

TOO FEW INSPECTORS

A Federation spokesman pointed out that in 1962 there were 200 inspectors in the state's Division of Industrial Safety but that today, despite the fact that there are more than a million more people in California's total work force, there are only 185 safety inspectors.

"The contrast between advanced state law and high injury experience in California results from the failure of the California government to provide adequate numbers of inspection and enforcement personnel," the Federation charged.

14,000 KILLED

To stress the "critical need" for federal action in the safety and health field, the Federation pointed out that between October 1968 and October 1969 more than 14,000 workers died of job injuries or job disease and that during that same period another 2.2 million suffered industrial injuries.

"Death on the job can come quickly as from falls or electrocution. It can come slowly as from coal dust or asbestos or pesticides. But come it does in fearful numbers," Pitts' statement observed.

While expressing preference for the O'Hara-Williams bill, the State AFL-CIO said that it was heartened that President Nixon recently deplored the "historically limited place of the federal government" in the safety field and has proposed federal legislation.

"We are encouraged by the reality that Congress is now debating the form of federal

legislation rather than the once argued issue of whether any federal legislation is required," the Labor Federation said.

AFL-CIO Legislative Director Andrew J. Biemiller spelled out organized labor's preferences for the O'Hara-Williams

bills in detail in testimony to the Committee in Washington on October 15.

The Nixon Administration's bills, HR 13373 and S.2193 are sponsored by Rep. William H. Ayres (R-Ohio) and Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.)

NEED STRESSED

To underscore the need to include public employees under any federal safety legislation, the Federation noted that injuries reported under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act alone increased from 109,000 in 1964 to 125,000 in 1968.

"The wide variance between state systems makes it quite clear that federal standards are essential if state employees are to realize the protection given workers in the private sector," the State AFL-CIO said.

In conclusion, it added:

"The time for Congressional action is now. The perils of industrial injury and death have been with us since the inception of the factory system. The issue has assumed new dimensions of environmental danger in the present age of scientific wonder.

U.S. STANDARDS VITAL

"Only federal legislation offering complete coverage of American workers and meaningful enforcement of proper federal standards can give our nation the kind of safe employment its workers deserve."

The two-day hearings were held at the Federal Building at 450 Golden Gate Avenue in San Francisco before the Select Labor Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Participating Congressmen included Reps. Dominick V. Daniels (D-N.J.); William J. Scherle (R-Iowa); William H. Ayres (R-Ohio); and Phillip Burton (D-Calif.).

Medicare Bill Deadline

Medicare beneficiaries have only until December 31, 1969 to file medical bills for services received between October 1, 1967 and September 30, 1968. There is no provision for late filing. Medicare claim forms and assistance may be obtained at your nearest Social Security office.

Reality of Pesticide Peril Bared at Hearing in S.F.

(Continued from Page 1)

spread among California farm children.

Dr. Lee Mizrahi of the Salud Health Clinic in Woodville said that a nutritional study of farm laborers and their children in the Woodville area uncovered, almost by accident, indications of low-grade poisoning among nearly 50 percent of the children tested.

The discovery was made after Dr. Mizrahi and fellow doctors sent blood samples to the State Health Department for a pesticide check.

The results disclosed that of 58 children tested, 27 showed distinct or borderline signs of pesticide poisoning, he said.

The insidiousness of pesticide poisoning is at least two-fold: First, because victims may not suspect the source of their illness, and, secondly, because a number of growers and county agriculture department officials have refused to disclose to workers or their representatives the types of pesticides being used on their crops.

The workers' right to know what pesticides he's being exposed to and to be protected against them is one of the key issues in the UFWOC's fight for union recognition and bargaining rights for farm workers.

Dr. Mizrahi said that the children, who ranged from three to 18 years old, apparently contacted parathion and other organic phosphate poisons in fields where they played or worked with their parents.

He said some of the children as well as their parents had been feeling sick and that they had been bothered by skin rashes, burning eyes, nausea, dizziness and vomiting.

Organic phosphate pesticides, he explained, are nerve poisons that cut the blood levels of an enzyme that is essential to the

operation of the nervous system.

While conceding that the full scope and significance of the clinic's findings requires more research, Dr. Mizrahi said:

"To me it is tragically absurd that in 1969 such a study by an obscure rural doctor should be the first one ever done on children.

"We think this problem is widespread," he declared.

Dr. Mizrahi's testimony served to reinforce testimony presented by the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, to the Select Labor Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor on the vital need for federal legislation to protect the safety and health of workers on the job.

It also pointed up the continued exploitation of child labor in California's \$4 billion plus agribusiness industry. This came about when one of a number of the affected children who were brought to the hearing by clinical staff members told the Congressmen that she had worked in the fields since she was five.

The girl, Theresa Arellano, an eight-year-old, who weighed only 55 or 60 lbs., said she had worked eight hours a day on Saturdays and Sundays during the school year and every day in the summer.

Dr. Thomas Milby, Chief of California's Occupational Health Bureau, underscored the critical nature of the pesticide peril when he observed:

"We do not think it is putting the case too strongly to suggest that if we fail to begin planning seriously right now, we may find ourselves with something approaching an epidemic of pesticide disability among laborers who work in soft fruits, nuts, olives, citrus and grapes."