

Reports of Officers to Fifty-Sixth Convention San Francisco, 1958

CALIFORNIA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

C. J. Haggerty, Secretary-Treasurer

810 David Hewes Building
995 Market Street, San Francisco

ROSTER OF STATE FEDERATION OFFICIALS

PRESIDENT

THOMAS L. PITTS

1221 Security Title Insurance Bldg.
530 West 6th Street, Los Angeles 14

SECRETARY-TREASURER

C. J. HAGGERTY

810 David Hewes Building, 995 Market Street
San Francisco 3

VICE PRESIDENTS

District No. 1

(San Diego and Imperial Counties)

THOMAS L. GOODBODY

227 "E" Street, San Diego 1

District No. 2

(City of Long Beach and Orange County)

M. R. CALLAHAN

324 E. Fourth Street, Long Beach 12

District No. 3

(Los Angeles City proper, Hollywood, North Hollywood, Burbank, San Fernando, Glendale, Pasadena, Pomona, Whittier, and San Bernardino and Riverside Counties)

(3A) C. T. LEHMANN

1133 Third Avenue, Los Angeles 19

(3B) PAT SOMERSET

7750 Sunset Blvd., Hollywood 46

(3C) GEORGE E. O'BRIEN

2316 West 7th Street, Los Angeles 57

(3D) JOHN T. GARDNER

1616 West 9th Street, Los Angeles 15

(3E) J. J. CHRISTIAN

1626 Beverly Blvd., Los Angeles 26

(3F) JAMES L. SMITH

1074 La Cadena, Riverside

District No. 4

(San Pedro, Wilmington, Redondo, Inglewood, Venice, and Santa Monica)

ROBERT J. O'HARE

2439 Santa Monica Blvd., Santa Monica

District No. 5

(Ventura, Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo Counties)

WILBUR FILLIPPINI

2211 Modoc Road, Santa Barbara

District No. 6

(Kern, Tulare, Kings, Fresno, Madera, Inyo and Mono Counties)

H. D. LACKEY

911 Twentieth Street, Bakersfield

District No. 7

(San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Mariposa, Tuolumne, Calaveras and Alpine Counties)

C. A. GREEN

P.O. Box 1399, Modesto

District No. 8

(San Mateo, Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties)

THOMAS A. SMALL

114 So. "B" Street, San Mateo

District No. 9

(San Francisco)

(9A) MORRIS WEISBERGER

450 Harrison Street, San Francisco 5

(9B) ARTHUR F. DOUGHERTY

1623½ Market Street, San Francisco 3

(9C) JACK GOLDBERGER

240 Second Street, San Francisco 5

(9D) NEWELL J. CARMAN

474 Valencia Street, San Francisco 3

District No. 10

(Alameda County)

(10A) ROBERT S. ASH

2315 Valdez Street, Oakland 12

(10B) PAUL L. JONES

2315 Valdez Street, Oakland 12

District No. 11

(Contra Costa County)

HOWARD REED

729 Castro Street, Martinez

District No. 12

(Marin, Sonoma, Napa and Solano Counties)

LOWELL NELSON

316 Virginia Street, Vallejo

District No. 13

(Sacramento, Yolo, Colusa, Glenn, Butte, Sutter, Yuba, Nevada, Placer, El Dorado and Amador Counties)

HARRY FINKS

5700 Sandburg Drive, Sacramento 14

District No. 14

(Humboldt, Del Norte, Mendocino and Lake Counties)

ALBIN J. GRUHN

Labor Temple, 9th and "E" Streets, Eureka

District No. 15

(Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, Plumas, Shasta, Tehama, Trinity and Sierra Counties)

ROBERT GIESICK

2045 Verda, Redding

The Executive Council of the Federation is composed of the President, the Vice Presidents and the Secretary-Treasurer.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. MARTIN C. KEATING, Chaplain
737 East Olive Avenue, Burbank

Reports of Officers to Fifty-Sixth Convention San Francisco, 1958

CALIFORNIA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

C. J. Haggerty, Secretary-Treasurer

810 David Hewes Building
995 Market Street, San Francisco

IN MEMORIAM

Jack T. Arnold

Whereas, Brother Jack T. Arnold, vice president of the Second District of the California State Federation of Labor since 1946, was taken by death on February 8, 1958; and

Whereas, Few men in labor have been more honored than Brother Arnold for the integrity of their leadership, or more beloved for their capacity for true friendship and sympathetic understanding of human as well as trade union problems; and

Whereas, Brother Arnold's role in the phenomenal growth of the labor movement in southern California during the last three decades is an outstanding one, rivalled only by his inspiring success in making the trade unions a vital and indispensable part of community life; and

Whereas, His passing has brought a deep and personal grief to all who knew him, and his loss is keenly felt throughout organized labor in California; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 56th convention of the California State Federation of Labor, upon adjournment, shall stand for a moment in silence, remembering our good friend, Jack Arnold, and expressing in this way our sorrow at his passing, our pride in his accomplishments, and our gratitude for his many years of generous endeavor on behalf of labor.

IN MEMORIAM

Harry W. Metz

Whereas, Brother Harry W. Metz, a vice president of District No. 9 of the California State Federation of Labor since 1956, passed away on July 17, 1958; and

Whereas, His years of service to the California labor movement were marked by his fidelity to the principles of American trade unionism; and

Whereas, He richly merited the affection and esteem with which he was regarded because of his loyal devotion to the aims and aspirations of working men and women everywhere; and

Whereas, His passing will be mourned by all who knew him as friend and brother; therefore be it

Resolved, That when the 56th convention of the California State Federation of Labor adjourns, we shall observe a moment of silence in memory of Harry Metz, and in grateful acknowledgment of his contributions to the cause of organized labor in our state.

IN MEMORIAM

Roe H. Baker

Whereas, Brother Roe H. Baker, president of the California State Federation of Labor from 1924 to 1926, and prior to that time, vice president of the Federation's District No. 9 for six years, passed away on November 12, 1957; and

Whereas, Brother Baker's progressive leadership during the difficult years following the first world war greatly benefited the organized workers of California; and

Whereas, Through many subsequent years of service to our government, his devotion and loyalty to the labor movement was unflagging, and all his life he honored the great principles of trade unionism; and

Whereas, We join with all who mourn the passing of this true and generous friend of labor; therefore be it

Resolved, That when the 56th convention of the California State Federation of Labor adjourns, we shall observe a moment of silence in memory of Roe H. Baker and in grateful acknowledgement of his many contributions to organized labor in our state.

IN MEMORIAM

Joseph D. McManus

Whereas, Brother Joseph D. McManus, a vice president from 1933 to 1938 of what is now District No. 9, passed away on September 15, 1958; and

Whereas, Brother McManus was an active and devoted leader in the California labor movement during one of the most crucial periods in its history; and

Whereas, Throughout his life, his loyalty to the principles and aims of organized labor was firm and true; and

Whereas, He will be greatly missed by his friends and his trade union brothers; therefore be it

Resolved, That the 56th convention of the California State Federation of Labor, before adjourning, will express in a moment of silence our sorrow over the loss of this brother, and our appreciation of his generous services to the labor movement in our state.

REPORTS OF OFFICERS

REPORT OF PRESIDENT THOMAS L. PITTS

Los Angeles, November 18, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—
Greetings:

We now approach the fifty-sixth time that delegates from all our affiliates in the state will meet in free and open convention. We will discuss and act upon the report of the Merger Committee and our Executive Council, which, upon adoption, will bring together the two state labor organizations of California into one body representing the unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO.

The report to be given is the result of many hours, days and weeks of hard work performed by our Merger Committee during the last two and one-half years.

In the accomplishment of a merger, it is expected that we should be better able to serve the people we represent and be of greater value to the community, state and nation in which we live. With this, of course, comes a great responsibility on the part of the Federation to every part of our society. I am sure that this responsibility will be uppermost in our minds at all times.

So-Called "Right To Work"

We have just completed a campaign which successfully gave Proposition 18, the so-called "right to work" measure, a resounding defeat at the polls on November 4. It is a sad fact that the workers in this state, as in some others this year, had to spend so much money to retain their rights and their ability to maintain a sound collective bargaining system which assures them some security. We must be grateful to the many citizens in our state who responded to the call to fair play and recognized the cleverly hidden dangers to the economy of California in this vicious measure.

The returns on Proposition 18 should readily point out to us that we have not done enough work in presenting the accomplishments and value of organized labor to the public, particularly to those who are not members of organized labor and are without direct contact with any one in organized labor.

Prior to our 1957 convention, your president began making speeches wherever possible on the subject of the so-called "right

to work" laws, and continued throughout this year doing the same at any type of gathering available. At this writing, the total number of such speeches made in many parts of the state are unknown. I know that many others did likewise, and I am grateful to them for their efforts. Other media must be found to communicate with the people so that they will be properly informed and not have their opinions molded by the vicious propaganda of those who seek to destroy unions. Likewise, we must respond to the confidence placed in the leadership of California unions by the electorate this past November 4. It just will not suffice to sit back with a comfortable feeling that a victory was won at the polls. While we prepare for our forthcoming convention and next year's legislative session, the forces responsible for Proposition 18 have met to review the campaign, ascertain why they lost, and to make preparations to continue building for a future effort in the same direction.

The enemies of labor still take comfort from the fact that they did succeed in Kansas, where just a short time ago such a measure was vetoed by the then Republican Governor, Fred Hall.

The registration campaign, spearheaded by our Federation and the councils throughout the state, and carried out by the local unions and councils in each area, was of immense value in defeating Proposition 18 and in aiding the election of candidates who will be responsible to the problems of the workers in the state. Much credit should be given to those organizations that did a very splendid job in this field.

Research and Education

Every day the need for research and education is growing greater and greater as it pertains to our unions. As labor expands its field of endeavor, it will begin to meet with more and more specialists from the employers' side of the table, who will be armed with all of the statistics and facts necessary to deal with the many problems developing from normal bargaining. I realize that many of our larger organizations at the present time have facilities to cope with this kind of problem. However, there are many of the smaller ones that probably at this moment are not sufficiently well organized in the field of

research. Ways and means will have to be found to put together all of the abilities that we can develop in this direction, and to make them available to these organizations that at the present time cannot carry their own load in this respect.

Research and the knowledge developed from it are all-important, not only in the long-range planning of our organizations, but also in enabling us to properly present our problems, so that the public, who are sitting on the side lines and frequently have no direct knowledge or understanding of the issues that arise in collective bargaining, will have a better and clearer comprehension of why the unions seek what they do. The positive nature of the union's case must be emphasized. The justice of the demands, the need for proposed changes must be stated in a way that will convince management experts and officials. When a corporation releases statistics and arguments to support its point of view, the union must be ready to prove its own case. Research departments will be of tremendous help in the preparation of material for this purpose. The program of education as it applies to members and the public likewise must be tied somewhat closely to research because they go hand in hand and each is dependent upon the other. So I urge upon all of our unions to do the best they possibly can in this direction.

Los Angeles Office

Much could be said about the activities and functions of the Federation's Los An-

geles office during the past year. I feel it is only necessary to point out that, as time has passed, more and more of our organizations have begun to use the facilities of the Los Angeles office. We have tried in every way to be of the best service we possibly could be to the affiliates.

Your president has been called upon, of course, to attend many conferences, participate in various community projects and make appearances at numerous hearings involving our organizations. I regret that it is a physical impossibility for me to appear at all of the meetings in the various communities in order to be of as much assistance as we can to our organizations. I am sure the officers and delegates will understand the physical impossibility in these instances.

We will attempt at all times to be of service wherever possible to our affiliates in keeping with the jurisdiction allotted to and properly belonging to our state labor organization.

In closing, I desire to express to all of the delegates my wish for a very successful convention, and, in addition, to express my appreciation to Secretary Haggerty, the attorneys for the Federation, and to all of the staff, and further, to all representatives of the various councils and local unions who have contributed so much in the way of cooperation to this office at all times throughout the past year.

Fraternally submitted,

THOMAS L. PITTS.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT THOMAS L. GOODBODY FOR DISTRICT No. 1

(San Diego and Imperial Counties)

San Diego, November 21, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—
Greetings:

Having been but recently selected as a vice president of the California State Federation of Labor, my report will be relatively brief.

Record Average Earnings

Reflecting the results of years of efforts by labor unions, the average hourly earning of production workers in San Diego manufacturing industries rose to a record high of \$2.31 per hour, 6 cents per hour above the average a year ago.

Public Employees

With the approval of the county board of supervisors on June 10, 1958, social security at last became a reality for San Diego county and municipal employees. This culminated a long and hard-fought battle by County Employees No. 127 and its International union.

San Diego Councils

San Diego's newly merged Central Labor Council held its first full-scale meeting on June 11, 1958, to initiate a new era for organized labor in San Diego. Delegates from AFL-CIO local unions met together to map plans for a combined enlarged organization.

The Building Trades Council of San Diego County has reported that the past year has been its most successful year since the reissuance of its charter in 1938. Employment has been maintained at nearly 100 per cent.

Wage Increases

Members of the Plumbers Union returned to work after a seven-week deadlock with a total wage increase of 55 cents per hour and fringe benefits.

Electricians No. 465 has a new two-year contract signed last October covering transit system maintenance employees. The contract provides for increases ranging from 7 cents to 9 cents per hour the first year, and from 8 cents to 11 cents the second year.

Laborers No. 89 reports that since 1950, it has grown from 800 to approximately 6,000 members. Great gains have been made in wages, hours, conditions and fringe benefits.

Retail Clerks No. 1222 gained local autonomy recently. This organization, together with its sister locals throughout the state, after months of effort, secured a contract with Montgomery Ward and Co., as well as additional organizational gains.

Culinary Workers No. 402 and No. 500 secured for all their members working in San Diego's hotels and restaurants a 5 per cent wage increase, effective March 1, 1958. Altogether, 2,000 members benefited by this increase.

Community Activities

The annual Christmas Party for underprivileged children will be held on December 22, 1958. This event is put on by the local unions in conjunction with the Salvation Army and is one of the most worthwhile benefits held during the holiday season as it brings so much happiness to so many children who otherwise would have a rather dismal Christmas.

The Mike Morrow Little League sponsored by local labor unions was once again a very successful project.

I should like to express my appreciation of the honor accorded me when I was selected to serve as a vice president for District One. I have enjoyed my association with my fellow officers and have endeavored to conduct myself in such a way as to further the interests of and aims of this Federation.

Fraternally submitted,
THOMAS L. GOODBODY.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT M. R. CALLAHAN FOR DISTRICT No. 2

(City of Long Beach and Orange County)

Long Beach, November 14, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—

Greetings:

During the past year, activities in this vice-presidential district, which embraces the city of Long Beach and Orange County, have been pretty well dominated by the campaign against "right to work" and political activities in general. I am pleased to report the splendid cooperation of the local movement in this area in mounting an effective campaign against this hostile and most vicious measure.

Campaign vs. Proposition 18

It must be remembered that the political leanings of the voters in District No. 2 are basically on the conservative side.

Orange County is one of the four Republican counties of the state, with a Republican registration in the general election of 112,944, as compared with 108,934 for the Democrats. Thus, the Democratic majority in Long Beach City is largely offset by the Orange County registration. I think it is fair to say that the movement in this area, perhaps more than any other part of the state, faced a real uphill battle in bringing the issues of "right to work" before the people.

Our registration efforts in laying the groundwork for the campaign against Proposition 18 were highly successful in offsetting the conservative vote of the area. Orange County is an excellent example of this registration success. Despite Orange County's heavy Republican edge, registration efforts between the primary election in June and the general

election produced a total of 38,750 new registrations, of which a full 21,930 were Democrats, as compared with 14,136 Republicans. Although in Orange County "right to work" carried by a small percentage vote margin, as was expected, we are confident that without the success realized in our registration drives, the "yes" vote would have been substantially higher. The local movement, I believe, deserves a pat on the back for a job well done.

In the city of Long Beach, of course, we were able to defeat Proposition 18 handily by a margin of some 20,000 votes. The vote turnout in the 18th Congressional District was 78.2 per cent of the registered voters, which was important not only in defeating Proposition 18, but also in dumping a long-time enemy of organized labor in the 44th Assembly District by the name of Herbert R. Klockslem, and electing in his place Joe Kinnick, a liberal Democrat, endorsed and supported by organized labor.

This victory was almost repeated in the 70th Congressional District, where labor-endorsed candidate Thomas D. Griffin came within a few thousand votes of defeating incumbent William S. Grant.

In Orange County, it is interesting to note the effect of our successful registration drive on the district elections in the county. Whereas endorsed candidate Dave Tickner in Assembly District 74, in the primary election received only 30 per cent of the total vote, in the general election he came within a hair's breadth of defeating incumbent Summer. This is in a district that is only 38.2 per cent Democratic. In District No. 75, endorsed candidate Richard K. Hanna handily defeated his Republican challenger, even though the district, by California standards, would usually go Republican. The local movement in this area is rightly proud of its accomplishments, and is determined that the spirit of unity gained in the recent campaign shall not be dissipated, but rather that it will be carried on into future activities, both political and economic.

Construction Boom

On the economic front, there has been a substantial improvement in the employment situation in this area, primarily due to the pickup in the construction industry, which in turn has given the service trades a shot in the arm.

The building trades in Orange County,

where population is expanding at a rapid rate, report a near full employment situation. The building and construction trades are in full swing, and problems incurred during this period of expansion are being skillfully handled by all unions.

Multi-million dollar shopping centers are in the process of construction with more coming. Trunk sewer lines amounting to \$22 million will open vast areas for building and construction.

The Newport Dunes Recreation Area at Upper Newport Bay will be one of the coastal attractions. This multi-million dollar project is being financed by Winthrop Rockefeller and his oil baron associates.

Disneyland is spending \$7 million more on their expansion program; 84-passenger submarines will be one of the features. In regard to freeway construction, both San Diego and the Riverside Freeways are progressing on schedule.

A substantial amount of height-limit building is also in the planning stages. The Huntington Beach steam plant is scheduled to build two more units. The Haynes steam plant, Seal Beach, will start work after the first of the year.

Commercial and residential building show a steady increase. Housing and classified installations are in progress in El Toro Marine Base, and at Los Alamitos Ammunition and Net Depot. These expansion activities, of course, are all related to the tremendous population expansion in Orange County. At the rate at which housing units are being constructed here, it is inevitable also that related construction activities should pick up.

New country clubs, golf courses and cemeteries have been constructed and are now available to the public. Some of the clubs are Los Coyotes, Buena Park, Yorba Linda, Los Alamitos, and Green River in Santa Ana Canyon, which covers three counties. Bowling alleys, supper clubs and new motels are cropping up all over the county. Also, the construction of retail stores is proceeding at a rapid clip. Sears Roebuck will build the largest store west of the Rockies in Buena Park, California. The beautiful Bullock's Fashion Square has just been completed in Santa Ana.

The building trades in Long Beach are also experiencing a pickup in activity. The number of projects on the planning boards last year during the building slump are now becoming a reality.

Work on many sizable projects is well

under way. These include the new Civic Center, safety buildings, Memorial Hospital, schools and libraries, as well as numerous other projects. Since space for housing tracts or any sizable projects is becoming extremely scarce, we can look forward to more remodeling jobs and large apartment building.

To date, permits totaling \$64,325,510 have been issued, in comparison to \$42,795,795 in permits issued during the same period last year. Plans for the development of the Long Beach Harbor are also now under way with the building of a new Harbor Department building, warehouse, wharves, transit sheds and many other improvements. We feel that the year ahead will see a continuance of the present building program.

In general, it can be stated that wage increases and added benefits are continuing to be enjoyed in all trades and crafts. However, we had a few anxious moments during the "right to work" campaign wondering just how long we would have them to enjoy.

Orange County Activities

In regard to the activities of the Central Labor Council of Orange County, I am pleased to report that business generally is proceeding very well. The crafts in this expanding county are working together for the general benefit of all unions. Our affiliates have reached favorable agreements with their employers and all strikes have been settled satisfactorily with only a few exceptions.

In joint conferences with Disneyland on grievances, the council reports that they have been getting excellent cooperation from management.

Service crafts in Orange County, such as the Retail Clerks, Butchers, Bakers, Culinary and Building Service, although going through difficult negotiations, are continuing to cooperate in every way with the council.

The Orange County Labor Council has worked very closely with civic organizations such as the Boys' Club, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, AID, Community Chest, Salvation Army and others. Organizations in the county have contributed liberally with monies and labor in building projects for the above groups. This program has meant much to the Orange County area, and is

well worth the effort and expense involved to persuade the leaders of these projects to cooperate so that labor's contribution to community life may be recognized and appreciated. The Council is also very fortunate in having elected judges in the superior courts who are considered fair to organized labor.

In general, it can be reported that organized labor in Orange County has made consistent progress during the past year, and that both the Central Labor and Building Trades Councils have improved their position as well as their prestige in the county.

Long Beach Council Merger

With regard to the Long Beach Central Labor Council, it should be noted that this organization, as such, will be out of business as soon as merger of the Los Angeles Labor Council with the CIO Council is completed. Due to the retirement of Secretary E. L. Brown, and the pending merger of the council with the Los Angeles Central Labor Council, I have been serving both as acting secretary and president of the council. At the present time, we have no definite date set for the merger at the Los Angeles County level.

In closing, I would like to pay tribute to two able leaders of organized labor in the Long Beach and Orange County area: Retired E. L. Brown, who served as secretary of the Central Labor Council for the past thirteen years; the late Jack Arnold, who served as secretary of Culinary Alliance No. 681 for a period of twenty years, and as vice president of the California State Federation of Labor in District No. 2 for fifteen years.

Finally, I would like to thank individuals who have contributed information for this annual report, namely William Fountain, Carlton Webb and Tom Matthews.

It has been a privilege and a pleasure to serve on the executive council. I am deeply appreciative of the cooperation that I have received from unions in the Second District, and from the executive officers of the California State Federation of Labor in carrying out my duties as vice president of District No. 2.

Faternally submitted,

MICHAEL R. CALLAHAN.

REPORTS OF VICE PRESIDENTS FOR DISTRICT No. 3

**(Los Angeles City Proper, Hollywood, North Hollywood, Burbank,
San Fernando, Glendale, Pasadena, Pomona, Whittier, and
San Bernardino and Riverside Counties)**

**REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENTS C. T. LEHMANN, PAT SOMERSET,
GEORGE E. O'BRIEN, JOHN T. GARDNER, J. J. CHRISTIAN
and JAMES L. SMITH**

Los Angeles, November 7, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor:

Greetings:

Defeat of "Right to Work"

Obviously the greatest effort ever put forth in connection with the activities of organized labor at any time was the intensified and well coordinated campaign carried out against the anti-union, so-called "right to work" law, known as Proposition No. 18. Every departmental council, craft council and all local unions worked in unison in Los Angeles at large under the S. O. S. (Save Our State) Local Committee. To all of them we express deep appreciation of the time and effort they put forth in this campaign which resulted in an overwhelming victory for organized labor and the working people at large of the state of California. We sincerely trust that the working people of the nation will take note of this success and realize that had California fallen in this fight, and had the voters in a majority been misled by the smear campaign conducted, the working men and women of the entire nation would have suffered and quickly under the same type of misleading legislation.

We presume that the affiliates of the California State Federation of Labor have carefully screened the reports of the California Secretary of State, which, of course, are of public record and which name names and amounts of money contributed to help put over this vicious anti-union measure in the recent campaign. We hope that all will remember well those who have claimed to be our friends but gave, apparently willingly, to help defeat the rights and privileges of working men and women. It should be very significant to all wage earners that large corporations here and out of state, even as far away as the Atlantic seaboard, contributed large sums of money to defeat organized labor. No one can be more guilty of sponsoring class warfare than these donors. With some humor and considerable sarcasm, we take particular note of the thousands of

dollars contributed by attorneys for large corporations who, as attorneys, themselves cannot work without belonging to and paying dues to their union and their continuous "in good standing" status is necessary to be privileged to work in California and is in direct contravention of their position in freely contributing toward the so-called voluntary unionism they tried to foist upon us.

Labor Aided Large Vote

We believe organized labor has the right to receive acclaim for having increased the voting registration in California, since it was due, we believe, largely to labor's efforts that registrations were increased so greatly. We submit that the success of the Democratic trend was greatly enhanced by the great increase of registered Democrats. This crisis and this election campaign produced, we think, the greatest amount of voter registration, precinct work before the election, and getting out the vote on election day that has ever been witnessed in the history of California.

From authoritative reports it appears that business interests now propose to continue to enlarge upon their efforts to educate the voting public into their philosophy and to do their utmost to replace liberal public office holders with those having in mind the best interests of large corporations, and because of this it is of the utmost importance that all of organized labor recognize the urgent need to increase its interest in all future political campaigns for candidates and issues on a local and national level for some time to come. The fight which has just been won has only been a temporary victory, and from here on apathy and complacency by organized labor and other liberal groups can be considered to be a decisive milepost on the road to the loss of benefits gained for wage earners over the past 50 years or more.

State Labor Merger

When the 56th convention of the California State Federation of Labor convenes

in San Francisco on December 8, 1958, there will have been a greatly changed situation in many phases of organized labor's daily life. At this convention, after much effort, the California State Federation of Labor will merge with the California Industrial Union Council into one body. Mergers will have been effected on several local levels.

The Teamsters

The Teamsters' organization as a complete unit, including its representatives and delegates, who have been and still are good friends and worthy allies, may be absent from our halls and assemblies but not from our hearts, nor from our daily activities. Because of the necessary liaison between the many other local organizations and the several Teamsters' local unions and joint councils, resulting from established labor agreements and recognized bargaining units, it seems certain that, although a legal breach exists, which we feel was not caused by the local Teamsters' councils, the cooperation and coordination between all other unions and that of the Teamsters' organizations cannot help but continue. It is the unquestionable desire of all the vice presidents from the 3rd District, and to the best of our observations the desire of all of the Federation's affiliated unions in this district, to continue this cooperation and coordination as much as is practical and possible. We shall continue to look toward the day that the Teamsters' splendid organizations will again be associated with us fully in conventions and assemblies of all kinds.

L. A. Central Labor Council

The Los Angeles Central Labor Council received 200 applications for assistance in negotiations and/or strike sanction during the year, which was given in each case by members of the council's staff, and only after all attempts to settle a dispute were exhausted the council, approved the strike sanction in 82 cases. However, in 35 cases only were the unions finally required to take this action. In most of the strikes only a small number of the members were involved, 16 of the cases have been settled, and in 165 of the 200 applications filed, the disputes were settled amicably through the assistance of the Central Labor Council.

Council Merger

The long standing merger negotiations between the Central Labor Councils of

Los Angeles, Long Beach, Pomona, San Gabriel, San Pedro, Wilmington and Santa Monica with the Greater Los Angeles CIO Council has finally resulted in an actual merger of these councils, which took place on November 21 of this year.

"Right to Work" Campaign

Immediately after the compulsory open shop measure was certified for the election and given Proposition No. 18, all of the central labor councils, department councils, district councils, industrial councils and joint boards in Los Angeles County banded together to form a committee to combat the campaign against this vicious legislation. This committee operated under the title "Los Angeles County Labor Committee to Save Our State" and coordinated its efforts throughout the campaign with the work being done by the California State Federation of Labor.

Practically every organization pitched in and did its share to make this work the great success that it was. Committees were formed from cross-sections of the entire labor movement to raise funds, to speak before labor, civic, fraternal, religious and other groups, to head up a field campaign, to do precinct work, to obtain increased voter registration, to get out the vote, and in general to perform the many chores essential in this type of operation. A tremendous job was done in all phases in voter registration, and the increase of the Democrats over the Republicans leaped ahead by tremendous numbers. Never before has there been witnessed the concerted effort that was offered and utilized in every phase of this campaign.

Plans were developed and used for newspapers, radio, television, billboards, pamphlets, advertising, as well as speaker campaigns, to educate the voting public about the injury that would be caused by the passage of Proposition No. 18, and to advise them of the effect upon California's economy and their own wages and pocket-books. Tremendous numbers of union members and their wives and families volunteered to assist in the field campaign which was highly successful.

Building Trades

Effect of NLRB Decision

The activities of all building trades unions have this year been beset with the problem of modifying their hiring procedure and the union security clauses of their agreements to conform to the Mountain Pacific decision of the National La-

bor Relations Board. Under the threat of the application of the Brown-Olds doctrine, which applied to a local union committing a proven unfair labor practice, it could require that local union to return all of the dues, initiation fees, and assessments collected for a period back to six months before the charge was placed with the National Labor Relations Board.

Legal counsels for local unions, craft councils, building trades councils, building trades international unions, and the Building and Construction Trades Department itself, have endeavored to reach conclusions with legal counsel of the National Labor Relations Board as to the proper language for a hiring clause establishing union security, and, as usual, the National Labor Relations Board gives no opinion or submits no direct or appropriate language, excepting that which would create an open shop condition in the construction industry which has always operated upon a strict union shop basis. Dispatching procedures necessary to be established vary from union to union, and from area to area, because of the historical customs of the several trades and the practices established within these trades over the many, many years. B. O., or Brown-Olds' Day, has been established as November 1, 1958, nationally, and it could be entirely possible that before long many construction unions will find themselves in extreme financial difficulties, if not entirely out of business, because of the application by the National Labor Relations Board of the B. O. doctrine against them.

There has been, and we presume there will continue to be, many employers and some contractor associations who seek to use this threat to operate with complete disregard of the terms of their labor agreement, because they feel that on their side now is the support of the National Labor Relations Board and of the present federal elected and appointed officers. It will be extremely interesting to analyze the reports of the vice presidents at the next convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, and to at that time determine if harm will have resulted to building trades unions from the now apparently malicious and vindictive acts of the National Labor Relations Board with its new double-edged sword. Brown-Olds is indeed to building trades unions bad odor.

1958 Contract Negotiations

Many of the labor agreements in the construction industry last year provided for a five-year term to the end that nego-

tiations in 1958 were chiefly upon cost items. Wage increases and fringe benefits agreed upon last year have hereby been automatically applied during 1958. However, the Roofers and Glaziers found it necessary to resort to strike action to conclude satisfactory wage adjustments during this year, but these strikes were short-lived and amicable settlements were reached shortly after the strikes took place.

Abuses Need Correction

Considerable attention must be and is being given by building trades' unions to bring about measures of correction for the abuses caused largely by owner builders. Waivers of mechanics' lien rights demanded by unscrupulous contractors and subcontractors, including the pressure for them caused by material dealers and banking institutions, is an abuse that cannot long continue. We hope a change will result from efforts now to be put forth. We anticipate the need to correct the promiscuity in the granting of licenses to contractors and subcontractors. We think the C-61 (miscellaneous grouping) is doing a great injustice, not only to building trades' workmen, but to their legitimate employers as well. We believe that the time has come when a prerequisite for having a contractor's license is that such a licensee be bonded. Abuses in free granting of contractor licenses, the misuse of the C-61 classification, the waiver of lien rights, and the non-responsibility of owner builders must be corrected as quickly as possible, and to this end we are devoting our interests this year.

Construction Safety

The safety laws and the safety orders of the State of California, either through improper or insufficient enforcement, or for pure lack of them, has caused injury and loss of life in the construction industry which can no longer be tolerated. Some of this is caused by the very apathy of representatives of building trades' unions themselves in either not knowing what the laws and safety orders are or what to do about them, but particularly for not taking an active interest in the Governor's safety conferences called on a sectional and statewide basis. Too many of these are attended more by representatives of employers and insurance companies and not enough by representatives of labor. We think the construction trades themselves have a job to do in this regard and if properly done should result in great corrections during the next year.

Employment

Employment in the construction trades has picked up a little since the tight-money upset of a few months ago, but it is not yet what it should be, and there is sufficient unemployment to warrant concern for our people who are out of work. Construction work of all kinds is needed and will be necessary before employment reaches normal.

Community Responsibilities

The vice presidents of this district sincerely plead with all affiliated unions to take the interest necessary in what goes on around them other than the strict question of wages, hours and working conditions for their immediate and respective members. The events of the year, and particularly of the recent past, prove conclusively the need to indulge wholeheartedly in civic and community affairs, and inquire into taxes, into the acts of city councils and county boards of supervisors, into the viewpoints of state assemblymen and state senators, into what goes on in the Congress in the nation's capitol, and into boards of education. The many forces of evil with great means of communication and with vast sums of money are directly and indirectly endeavoring to persuade the general public that organized labor is a black mark upon the nation's economy, and that the philosophy of large business groups is to the better interests of the wage earners of the nation. To represent labor in any capacity in this day and age requires much more work and effort to offset the psalm singing of false prophets. Let us hope we can apply ourselves to this and do our jobs well.

Building Service Employees

Building Service unions fared fairly well notwithstanding the economic slump felt throughout the country. Building Service unions in the motion picture industry suffered some setbacks due to poor business conditions, but new organizations in the television studios and among parimutuel employees have resulted in an overall gain in membership. Added to this were the great membership gains in civil service jurisdictions and in private industry covering office buildings, maintenance contractors, bowling alleys and markets. The Los Angeles Dodgers provided employment for more than 350 of Local 399's members due to the baseball season, which more than offset employment losses in other amusement industries. Contracts were improved by all Building Service locals with substantial wage increases

and fringe benefits, such as paid holidays and additional vacation periods, being received.

Bakery and Confectionery Workers

The expulsion of the old Bakery and Confectionery Workers International Union for having been found guilty of violating the AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Code resulted in a charter being granted to the American Bakery and Confectionery Workers International Union. Most of the membership of the old B & C Unions have decided to remain within the AFL-CIO and have transferred over to the newly chartered ABC.

Garment Workers

Unions of the garment industry experienced a repetition of the depression conditions in that industry suffered most of the time since 1948, except that the layoffs were more frequent and of longer duration with problems never more severe than in the recent past. Despite this, there has been a slight gain in membership due to an intensive organizing drive which continues on a year-round basis. The coat and suit industry on a "vigilance" basis brings in non-union factories as they open business. Mop-up operations returned contractors utilized by the coat and suit employers in the outlying areas of southern California back to union contracts where the wages, benefits and working conditions of employees can be more safeguarded. The dress and sportswear industries face a tremendous task of organizing work because of a different set of conditions, chiefly the high mobility of the industry and the heavy mortality of shops each year.

In addition, the compulsory open shop drive has made success more difficult since many employers have become more adamant against inclusion of union shop conditions. A number of strikes resulted because of this hardened attitude on the part of employers; however, the union continues to mark up gains. Labor agreements were renewed by the Cloak Joint Board with the Los Angeles Coat and Suit Manufacturers Association and with the Los Angeles Coat and Suit Contractors Association, and a number of non-affiliated employers producing wage increases for operators, cutters, pressers, finishers, lining makers, lining setters and skirt makers, special machine operators and miscellaneous workers.

The Cloak Joint Board expanded its health benefit plan by increased benefits

in several items. The Sportswear Joint Board this year initiated a new program of financial benefits to the workers in its shops covering dress sportswear and belt industries.

Hotel and Restaurant Employees

Despite a national recession and a record high in bankruptcies in the Los Angeles area, the organizing efforts of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Unions of Los Angeles continue to make this the fastest growing group of catering unions in the country by adding new contracts covering more than 1500 employees within the past 12 months. Fringe benefits were increased, particularly health and welfare insurance. Under a recently provided-for Emergency Trust Fund, welfare benefits have been initiated to protect members in times of financial or legal crisis. The overall contract improvements during the past year include an industry-wide minimum wage increase of 7.5 per cent, plus an additional 2.5 per cent increase in health and welfare benefits.

Motion Picture Industry

The unions and guilds in the Hollywood AFL Film Council have taken the lead in urging motion picture industry management to join in a united effort to improve the economic condition of the industry, which has steadily deteriorated since the end of World War II.

The council engaged Dr. Irving Bernstein, historian and economist, on the staff of the UCLA Institute of Industrial Relations, to conduct an impartial, independent study of the nature, extent and causes of the problems facing the motion picture industry.

The most vital issue affecting the workers in Hollywood continues to be runaway production, with American producers making more and more pictures in foreign countries, using foreign craftsmen who are paid far less than American scales.

Mr. Bernstein's report—a printed 78-page document titled "Hollywood at the Crossroads; An Economic Study of the Motion Picture Industry"—has been widely distributed and has aroused a great deal of discussion, most of it favorable, but some of it critical of the council for daring to expose the true state of the industry.

Planning conferences already have been held with such farsighted industry leaders as Eric Johnston and Charles Boren, and

the studio union officials have high hopes that much good will be accomplished through this council project.

Although discussion regarding pay-television appears to have died down of late, it is the position of the Hollywood AFL Film Council that pay or subscription television service could revolutionize the entertainment industry, provide additional employment for tens of thousands of American workmen and give the public better entertainment, culture and education in the home than is possible with the present form of television supported solely by advertising. Unfortunately, opponents of pay-television are unwilling to give the public the opportunity to test and decide its merits.

The Film Council voted a resolution calling on the Federal Communications Commission to authorize widespread public tests in order that the merits of pay-television service could be analyzed and compared with television programming controlled by advertisers and networks.

Metal Trades

Employment in the metal trades has pretty well leveled off. The Metal Trades Council brought about the defeat of a petition by the United Welders of America who, through the procedure of the National Labor Relations Board, endeavored to raid the metal trades of a unit at the C. F. Braun Co. in Alhambra. Hearings held locally and in Washington, where appearances were made by President Brownlow of the Metal Trades Department, International and council representatives, brought about the defeat of the petition instituted by the United Welders, resulting in a policy, which can be used nationally, confirming the fact that welding can be used as a process and recognizing the welder's torch as a tool. Members can now rest assured that the present National Labor Relations Board is of no mind to regard welding as a severable craft.

Printing Trades

The activities of the Printing Trades are highlighted by the strike of the Photo Engravers Union in all commercial engraving plants. In settling the strike, considerable wage increases were received as well as additional payments to their health and welfare fund and the inclusion of additional holidays with pay. The council and four of its unions moved into new buildings on properties purchased and now owned by these unions and the council.

Bookbinders concluded wage increases plus a night-shift differential and reduced its work week to 36¼ hours.

Electrotypers report that wage increases and an employer-paid complete hospital plan were received. In the commercial printing field, the unions have sustained an organizing drive against non-union printing plants in general, and have continued their drive against the notoriously non-union Charles R. Hadley Co. and their efforts to organize the Times-Mirror plants.

Teamsters

Although during the past year, and under the direct orders of the National AFL-CIO, the Teamsters' organizations have been required to withdraw from central and state bodies, we believe it of importance to report on their activities during such time as they were in affiliation and for the reason that mutual pacts with other unions and the structure of local labor agreements provide a relationship which must continue despite the problems brought about by expulsion. In the face of these problems and despite a general slow-down in the economy, the Teamsters local unions in southern California have continued to make gains in membership and contract conditions. Wage gains and fringe benefits have been received in every industry having contracts with the Teamster locals. Organization efforts in laundry, automotive, parking lots, van and storage, and warehousing have been very successful. Joint organizational programs with local unions and councils of the Teamsters for their members, in addition to joint organizational programs with unions and councils of other crafts, have resulted in bringing union conditions and wages to hundreds of unorganized workers. The California Teamsters Legislative Council has been expanded to represent the Teamsters on a statewide basis and work with the State Federation of Labor on problems affecting all of organized labor. An intensive program of safety, both on the docks and the highways, has served to keep the membership safety-conscious and prevent accidents.

Teamsters' locals have been especially active in promoting baseball for youth. They have sponsored baseball teams in the Little League, Colt Pony League, Babe Ruth and other organized baseball efforts and many members have been active in organizing and leading such programs.

Members of the meat drivers local collected 10,000 pounds of meat and trucked it to Lake Charles, Louisiana, for victims of the hurricane disaster there. The three

dairy locals sponsored a booth at the Pomona Fair to promote the consumption of dairy products.

The Joint Council of Teamsters worked very closely with the Air Pollution Control District to help lick the smog problems. They also sponsored the Junior Golden Gloves program to teach physical fitness and sportsmanship to underprivileged kids.

In order to work with the balance of the labor movement, the Joint Council set up a "Right to Work" Committee, which has been collecting monies and conducting an educational program on the real meaning of the law. The committee worked very closely with the State Federation of Labor and the Los Angeles County Committee to Save Our State for the campaign against Proposition No. 18—the anti-labor "right to work" law. Through the Southern California Teamster, continued efforts are being made to inform members of the story behind the news and counteract the bias and prejudice of the daily press.

Standing Committee of Central Labor Council

The organized labor movement of Los Angeles County, through the auspices of the Central Labor Council, has been and continues to do an excellent job in many fields. Local standing committees of the council include committees on church, civic, charities, education, health plans, unemployment and disability insurance, use of the union label and veterans. Each committee has done an outstanding job in its field.

United AFL Voters League

The United AFL Voters League, acting as the political arm of all councils and unions of the AFL in Los Angeles County, has had outstanding success. In the primary election all of the labor-endorsed candidates, with the exception of one, received the nomination of their own party. In addition, several labor-endorsed candidates were elected in the primary. The league was active in many municipal elections and has enjoyed success in practically every instance. Considerable credit is given to Thelma Thomas who, as director of the United AFL Voters League, has displayed an unusual ability in analyzing each political situation and has had considerable success in increasing the number of affiliates to the league and in establishing a closer relationship with public officials. The league has actively sponsored a registration drive among union

members on a year-round basis. It has assisted unions in checking their membership to find those who are not registered as well as precincting membership lists. It has continued to work with minority groups in an attempt to obtain fair employment practices legislation on a local as well as a state level. It has been successful in obtaining the appointment of several AFL members on city and county committees and boards and commissions.

In conclusion, the vice presidents of the 3rd District wish to particularly express

their appreciation and pleasure at having been given the opportunity to serve as vice presidents of the 3rd District of the California State Federation of Labor, and for the fine cooperation we have received from all concerned. It has been indeed a privilege to serve you.

Fraternally submitted,

C. T. LEHMANN.
PAT SOMERSET.
GEORGE E. O'BRIEN.
JOHN T. GARDNER.
J. J. CHRISTIAN.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT JAMES L. SMITH FOR DISTRICT No. 3F

Riverside, November 5, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—
Greetings:

This report must start with a word on Palm Springs, as it was in this city that the entire statewide campaign for the "right to work" originated. The wonderful aid received from unions and councils throughout the state was instrumental in defeating the opposition on every legal level.

Progress continues to be made in the Palm Springs organizing campaign with only a few major holdouts.

George Meany - National Orange Show

Of nationwide importance was the appearance of President George Meany, introduced by President Tommy Pitts, speaking to a capacity crowd at the National Orange Show. President Meany did a tremendous amount of good for the labor movement in his speech against "right to work", which was carried by the major news services.

The San Bernardino-Riverside Building Trades Council, the Riverside Central Labor Council and the San Bernardino Central Labor Council joined to sponsor this event, which included a booth at the Orange Show against Proposition No. 18. Over two hundred thousand persons attended the show. The Union Label and Service Trades Department, as well as many International unions aided in giving items and prizes to the public.

San Bernardino Labor Council

The merger of the San Bernardino Central Labor Council was completed after a merger convention was held at the Steel-

workers Auditorium in Fontana. All groups have worked well together, not only on the various problems of organized labor, but on political matters as well. Voter registration reached a new high.

An outstanding Labor Day celebration was held in San Bernardino, attended by several thousand people, including outstanding political and civic leaders. This again was an opportunity to present labor's views against Proposition No. 18.

Riverside Labor Council

The Riverside Central Labor Council continues to coordinate the Palm Springs organizing campaign as it has done the past several years.

An outstanding program of community relations has been developed throughout the county which has received recognition from top civic leaders, United Fund and various health and welfare agencies.

While the merger did not present any serious problems, the council continues to grow with the addition of the former CIO unions and other new affiliations.

Political activities have been well coordinated, resulting in a great increase of new voter registrations and gains made in labor political objectives.

The AFL-CIO Women's League continues to serve as an important part of council activities.

San Bernardino-Riverside Building Trades Council

The Building Trades Council has worked closely with the two central labor councils in all matters of registration of voters and political activity. Matters of far-reaching legal implications have been undertaken by the Building Trades Council.

Organized labor was able to stem the

tide of anti-labor decisions which have been handed down throughout the state during the past year. In one case which attracted nationwide interest, the District Council of Painters successfully defended the right of unions to restrict the manner in which their members will render services. The Orange Belt Chapter Painting and Decorating Contractors Association claimed that restrictions upon the use of tools was in restraint of trade. Attorney Lionel Richman successfully convinced the court that a union has the right to restrict hours that its members will work, to restrict the wage below which they will not work, and to restrict the means by which they will render their services, and the action was dismissed.

During the same period, the first municipal so-called "right to work" ordinance was declared unconstitutional by the District Court of Appeal when it affirmed the decision of the Riverside Superior Court, holding the Palm Springs ordinance to be beyond the jurisdiction of the city to pass. In his argument to the district court, Attorney Richman pointed out that the legislature had already preempted the field.

In another action of first importance, the Building Trades Council filed suit to compel a building contractor to terminate a subcontract with a painting subcontractor who was signatory to a contract with

District 50 of the United Mine Workers. Attorneys Richman and Nicoson argued to the court that while the United States Supreme Court had held that "hot cargo" clauses in union contracts could not be enforced by picketing, they did not say that they were illegal. The court agreed and issued an injunction requiring the contractor to cancel the subcontract.

Conclusion

To the many who have worked with me during the past year, I express deep appreciation for their aid and spirit of cooperation. Our problems have been many, but by working together we can win our fight for the common cause.

To Tommy Pitts and C. J. Hyans of the State Federation, and Irvin Cary of the AFL-CIO, I express the thanks of all local organizations for their many appearances and help on these problems that have faced this area.

Due to the limitations of this report, only the high points of interest and achievements can be noted. I regret that space and time does not permit a more detailed report and recognition of the many fine men in this area who have performed so well in the past busy year.

Fraternally submitted,

JAMES L. SMITH.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT ROBERT J. O'HARE FOR DISTRICT No. 4

(San Pedro, Wilmington, Redondo, Inglewood, Venice and Santa Monica)

Santa Monica, November 20, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—

Greetings:

The biggest and most important job in District No. 4 the past year was Proposition 18. We are proud to say that we played a most important part in this campaign. Each week we had from fifty to a hundred and twenty-five members ringing doorbells and distributing material against this proposition. We contributed financially to the overall campaign. I wish to thank all the members in the district who participated with so much of their time in this worthwhile campaign.

Construction Activity

Once again, building and construction activity has hit a new high in class "A" industrial building. We have nine million dollars in building and construction at the

International Airport. This is only a small start on a fifty-nine million dollar program, which includes new hangars, ticket offices and long, high-speed runways for the new jets.

We have just finished a three and a half million dollar program at Pacific Ocean Park, and we are to start another two million dollar program at this park. We also have negotiated a maintenance agreement with these people that we think is outstanding, with the outside scale, two weeks' vacation with pay, seven holidays with pay, premium overtime and all fringe benefits.

In Santa Monica in the past year we have completed a three million dollar Civic Auditorium, with a seating capacity of 2700 and plenty of meeting rooms; also, a three million dollar Surf Motel with a 180-room capacity as well as large dining rooms and coffee shop. We also have several large apartment buildings from 20 to

50 units; a twelve-story, 200-room addition to the Miramar Hotel; and several large steam plants along the coast, mostly in the Redondo area.

Aircraft Cutbacks

One of the big problems which this area has to face is that there is no diversification of manufacturing, and any decline in aircraft production means a quick decrease in distributive and service employment. Because of cutbacks in plane manufacturing and fewer people needed on missile work, we are having a lot of unemployment in this field.

Employment Situation

Offsetting the effect of the aircraft cutbacks to some extent has been the irresistible population growth in the area, which has inevitably brought in its train new consumer outlets, especially food stores. In the Santa Monica and South Bay district, several national and local chain markets have opened. As a result, both the Butchers and the Retail Clerks report membership gains.

Electrical Workers No. 11 have successfully undertaken a farsighted program that will be of great benefit from now on. Although work in the building trades jurisdiction dropped considerably during the period of recession, Local 11, recognizing that the electronic age is upon us, made large gains by obtaining the jurisdiction of installing and hooking up such equipment. They were also able to bring maintenance work that was normally being done by non-union workers at a lower wage scale within their jurisdiction.

The credit for these gains they give to the educational meetings that are held each month, as well as to the night classes offered at many technical trade schools. Local 11's members show good attendance at both these programs. As a result, Local 11's officers have been able to indicate to an educated membership what is best for them. Advance knowledge, personal appearance and social conduct have all added up to help this union sell labor in many fields previously closed to it. One of the big factors that promoted this idea was the union's excellent apprenticeship program. Young, aggressive boys, who are looking forward to a good future, have made this an exceptionally strong program. The advances already made attest to the soundness of the belief which this union has acted upon—that times are changing rapidly and that we must change our ideas and habits with the times.

Health, Welfare and Pensions

The health and welfare and pension programs of the local unions in this district are functioning admirably. These are typical reports:

Plumbers No. 545 have a health and welfare program which is administered 100 per cent for the benefit of the members and is considered to be one of the best in the country. Contributions to their pension plan will commence on January 1, 1959.

Members of the Butchers Union and all their dependents are covered by a health and welfare plan, to which the employer contributes \$14 per month for each employee. They also have an active pension plan to which the employer contributes 10 cents per hour up to a maximum of 173 hours per month. This plan covers five Butchers' locals in southern California with a membership of approximately 10,000.

The insurance and medical plan of Retail Clerks No. 1442 is administered jointly by the union and the employers. Significantly, many doctors in the area, contrary to the policy of the American Medical Association, have subscribed in writing to the terms and conditions of the medical plan. Through negotiations with the employers, trustees of the local were able to obtain \$5,000 life benefits for members as an addition to the medical plan. The food division of the local has enjoyed a pension plan for nearly two years. Now, effective January 1, 1958, the drug division is also covered by the pension plan, paid for totally by the employers and not integrated with social security.

Industrial Relations

On the whole, our labor-management relations have been conducted on a friendly basis with our employers. Fewer strikes have occurred and wage increases secured through negotiations have been carried out to cope with normal increases which have taken place throughout the balance of the state.

Without specifically reporting the wage increases of any particular union, it can be said that the average increases secured vary from 7½ cents to 33 cents per hour. It is also well to point out that considerable advancements have been made by the various trade unions in our district, and that the vast majority have added pension programs to their health and welfare agreements.

Political Activity

Space does not permit a well-deserved account of the campaign carried on in District No. 4 to defeat the "right to work" Proposition 18, and to elect labor's candidates. The vigorous activity of all the local unions and councils was outstanding. This included registration of voters, the distribution of literature and the delivery of speeches to civic, church and other groups, and finally, taking voters to the polls on election day. I cannot praise too highly the work that was done.

Community Relations

The list of community projects in which

our unions take part is a long one. As they have for the past many years, they participated wholeheartedly and effectively in numerous fund-raising campaigns, such as the Community Chest, United Success Drive, Red Cross and many others.

It has been an honor to represent the labor movement in District No. 4, and to serve the California State Federation of Labor, as a vice president. I take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to all who have assisted me in meeting the problems and accomplishing the ends of organized labor in this sector of California.

Fraternally submitted,

ROBERT J. O'HARE.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT W. L. FILLIPPINI FOR DISTRICT No. 5 (San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties)

Santa Barbara, November 8, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—
Greetings:

During the year just past the tri-county area has experienced a number of significant developments, each of which affected, to a greater or lesser degree, the existence of organized labor within the district's boundaries.

These developments include a rapid rise in population; great activity in the building trades; the start, continuation or completion of large projects, both governmental and private; a steady influx of industry; a growing political awareness in the working people; and the onset of, the campaign against and the eventual victory over the misbegotten concept known as "right to work."

Since the last-named issue, although purely negative and destructive in nature, took up such a large share of labor's time, effort and money, I deem it appropriate to report first on the district's conduct of the campaign against the compulsory open shop law.

"Right To Work"

The proponents of so-called "right to work" in California made their first public demonstration in District No. 5 in March, 1957, when one Leonard Keefer, self-styled executive secretary of the Los Angeles Citizens' Committee for Voluntary Unionism, told an Oxnard newspaper that his committee was open for speaking engagements before civic and business groups in the Ventura area.

The first actual clash came when Keefer addressed a meeting of the Oxnard Rotary Club in April, 1957, and was ably rebutted at the club's next meeting by John F. Henning, research and publicity director of the California State Federation of Labor.

Labor Defense Committees

Tri-county labor's defense against right to work was complicated by District 5's geography. Because of the considerable distance between the county centers of population, it was found most practical for each county to set up its own labor defense committee. By March of 1958 such committees had been established in San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara and Ventura. Ventura, in fact, having first felt the encroachment of "right to work" forces, had established the basis for such a committee by December of 1957.

In practice, each general committee was made up of delegates from the local central labor and building trades councils and from the balance of labor in the area, whether affiliated or not. Each defense committee was divided into working subcommittees, such as finance, publicity, voter registration, speakers' bureau and get-out-the-vote.

As 5th District vice president, I had the duty and privilege of serving as liaison officer among the three defense committees. It is with pleasure and gratitude that I report the complete and unstinting cooperation I received in the performance of this task from the union leaders and membership throughout the tri-county area. Without this cooperation and willingness to overlook minor differences,

labor could not have achieved victory at the polls on November 4.

A detailed account of District 5's campaign against "right to work" would fill a sizeable volume and is impossible in a report of this nature.

Campaign vs. "Right to Work"

In brief, the "right to work" petitions applied for in Los Angeles in January, 1958, were first reported abroad in District 5 toward the end of March. The newly-formed defense committees at this time concentrated their efforts on trying to prevent an adequate collection of signatures.

When, in spite of all our efforts, the "right to work" initiative qualified for the ballot, the committees photostatted the petitions, made mailing lists therefrom and subsequently communicated by mail or in person with the signers. From that time on, alerting the public became the committee's chief task. This was accomplished by the showing of movies at the meetings of union, fraternal, civic and religious groups; by holding public rallies; by distribution of campaign literature and by lectures and debates. Some indication of the intensity of the lecture campaign staged by the committees may be had in the fact that I, as only one member of the over-all speakers' bureau, made forty-one addresses, of which ten were open debates, before various organizations.

Voter Registration Drive

Meanwhile, tri-county labor conducted an all-out voter registration drive before both the primary and the general elections. This was sparked when a comparison of union membership lists with the records of the respective county clerks showed an appallingly low percentage of registered voters. The success of this drive was amply demonstrated at the polls when the chips were down.

Campaign on TV

A notable facet in the campaign against "right to work" was the formation of a San Luis Obispo - Santa Barbara joint television committee in May, 1958. Ventura did not participate in this because of their poor television reception of Santa Barbara Station KEY-T, which blanketed the other two counties well, and because the Los Angeles TV coverage was excellent in Ventura. During the thirteen weeks of its production the KEY-T show, "Let's Look at Labor," culminating just before the November election, improved steadily in quality. As a result, unionists in the covered area are seriously considering the

employment of the TV medium in a projected campaign to improve labor's relations with the public.

All three committees did an outstanding job of distributing literature at county and local fairs, through the mail and by door-to-door canvassing. In Ventura, unionists not only entered an eye-catching anti-Prop. 18 float in the fair grounds, but also gave out over 8,000 complimentary market bags, labeled "Vote No on Prop. 18" and stuffed with literature, to the fair-goers.

Role of Press

District 5 was fortunate in having the editorial support of its three major daily newspapers, all of which came out against Proposition 18. Of these the San Luis Obispo Telegram-Tribune was especially outspoken in labor's behalf. The Union Labor News, official publication of the central labor and building trades councils in the tri-county area, directed its main effort against Proposition 18 from the outset of the campaign, as a matter of course.

No summary of the fight against "right to work" would be complete without an expression of the deepest appreciation of the splendid job done in our behalf by the Los Angeles Citizens' Committee Against Prop. 18 and by its representative in the tri-county region, Harry Goldberger. The defense committees made numerous and heavy demands on Brother Goldberger, and his effective help was invariably forthcoming.

Tri-Counties Defeat Prop. 18

The labor leaders in each of the three counties of District 5 put the job of defeating "right to work" before all other considerations, and the rank and file responded nobly to their urgings. The proof of the pudding lies in the fact of Proposition 18's defeat in all three counties, including Santa Barbara, where there was a two-to-one voting margin in favor of the Republicans, and in San Luis Obispo, a predominantly agricultural area.

Organized labor in the tri-counties did a creditable job, against geographical and political odds, in combating "right to work." I am proud to have had a part in the campaign and to have received, throughout it, the solid cooperation of my fellow-workers.

I believe that here labor was strengthened and solidified by the battle, and is now in a mood to tackle the long-range task of improving its grass-roots public relations, to the end that any future at-

tempt to foist "right to work" on California would meet certain and crushing failure.

Population Increase

In the last few years the district has experienced an almost explosive rise in its population count, and this trend is increasing, rather than diminishing. The impact of this rapid growth is being felt profoundly in every phase of community life. Not only is the physical aspect of the area changing, but also there are changes in the civic, religious and political currents as the population swells and neighborhoods once rural and agricultural become urban and industrial.

So strong is this growth force that the three counties have been spared, to a large extent, the worst effects of the unemployment brought on in many other areas by the Administration's policy of planned recession and tight money, although these have hindered full development.

Building, Service and Entertainment Trades

Whether people have come to our community to work or to retire, they need housing, clothing, food, recreation and schooling. These demands have stimulated the building, service and entertainment trades. Housing tracts, low-rent apartment buildings and whole community centers are springing up on the outskirts of many towns, and what was a suburban neighborhood a few months ago is downtown today.

News of this activity has spread rapidly, and every day sees the arrival of additional members of the work force from every part of the country. This presents both a problem and an opportunity to union representatives.

Projects

In each of the three counties large public or private projects have contributed to construction activity. Outstanding is the development of the huge complex of Vanderberg Air Force Base, formerly known as Camp Cooke. Here not only a military installation is taking shape, but a whole city is rising where before were only sagebrush, manzanita and gophers.

The steam plant at Mandalay Beach, military building at Point Mugu and on San Nicholas Island, Casitas and Vacuero Dams are examples of large projects that are not only providing employment during

their construction, but also will create other jobs in their future operation and maintenance.

Industry

Industry of all types is moving into Ventura County, much of it from the over-crowded and cramped Los Angeles area. The implications of this trend are, for labor, enormous. The development of one or more good-sized payrolls can change a community from one dominated by a handful of wealthy ranchers to one favorable to the hopes and aspirations of wage-earners and their families.

In Santa Barbara a marked change in the policy of the city council, formerly against the presence of factories of any sort, is resulting in a rapid development in the field of electronics and other smokeless industries.

San Luis Obispo's power needs, both at present and for the foreseeable future, can be easily met by the output of the impressive Moro Bay steam plant, but the looked-for industrial and business growth has been withered by a chronic shortage of water. It is our fervent hope that under the new state administration the area's water development program will become a reality instead of remaining a legislative football. There is no reason why San Luis Obispo, adequately watered, should not match the phenomenal growth now being displayed by Santa Barbara and Ventura.

The Job Ahead

For labor leaders in District 5 the chief jobs that lie ahead are organization and education. Good work by union organizers can bring these swarms of newcomers into the community of labor, but only an effective and long-range educational program will make them productive members thereof. There is a demonstrable need for going back to the basic principles of trade unionism. To create a card-carrier is to do only the easier part of the job.

Also the political interest of union members, roused from long lethargy by the onset of the "right to work" crisis, must be encouraged and directed. Voter registration among union members must change from an hysterical, last-minute scramble to the steady application of a regular policy.

The community at large, as well as the union member; must come in for its share of education. Here the job would seem to be the development of mutual fields of interest and responsibility, of daily and

matter-of-fact contact. Such a program should aim for the time when a union officer or member is generally regarded as a constructive member of his community, not as a potential troublesome intruder.

The challenges and opportunities for organized labor presented today in District 5 are awesomely large and numerous, but if the leaders and members will continue to display the spirit and industry that defeated Proposition 18, I know that these challenges and opportunities can and will be met.

* * *

The space limitations of this report prevent my including even a brief tip of the hat to each separate labor council and its leaders in this area, much as I would like to do so; yet I could not consider it complete without paying a heartfelt tribute

to the outstanding service record of the veteran secretary-treasurer of the Santa Barbara Building and Construction Trades Council, Jay Smedley.

The fact that the Santa Barbara Council enjoys its fine standing in the Federation today is largely due to Jay's thirty-eight-year record of the self-denying and skillful conduct of his office.

For the greater part of this past year illness has kept him laid up, while I have heard that no man is completely indispensable, I judge by the gaping vacuum created by Jay's absence that here is a man who comes pretty close to being the exception that proves the rule.

Fraternally submitted,

W. L. FILLIPPINI.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT H. D. LACKEY FOR DISTRICT No. 6

(Kern, Tulare, Kings, Fresno, Madera, Inyo and Mono Counties)

Bakersfield, November 3, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—
Greetings:

During the past year the affiliates in District No. 6 have continued to progress, and, according to reports received, most all the local unions have been able to maintain their membership with little increase as in the past.

Most of the collective bargaining agreements have been consummated with varying degrees of success.

Employment Conditions

During the early part of 1958 there was considerable unemployment throughout the district, the greatest being in the building trades unions. Since about March of 1958 various projects throughout the area were started and practically total employment has been enjoyed by most of the affiliates.

In the Fresno area, there has been a number of flood control projects, one being let recently—the Success Dam in Tulare County; Mammoth Pool project in Madera County, consisting of a dam and power house with the Terminus Dam on the Kaweah River in Tulare County to be bid. The long expected development of the Lemoore Air Base apparently will be underway by the first of the year as one contract has been let for runways and engineering.

It is reported in the Tulare-Kings Counties areas that employment is improving with most of our people working.

In the Kern County area, considerable employment has been enjoyed due to the vast construction projects at the Edwards Air Force Base and also at the Naval Ordnance Test Station at Inyokern. Due to the large numbers of building tradesmen employed on these projects, considerable growth in these communities has taken place, due to the payroll expended in these areas.

In the Bakersfield area, a large freeway system is about to be undertaken with four grade separations being approved by the voters in the early part of 1958. These four projects alone entail several millions of dollars.

Due to the development of the Bishop area by the Federal and State Recreation Departments, a tremendous amount of road work has been in progress for some time. The federal government has made Death Valley a Federal Monument, and considerable activity is going on, with a proposed museum and administration building and a housing project under construction.

The Culinary Alliance in the Kern County area reports their membership growth is about the same with progress being made in most of the area. In 1954, Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders No. 550 purchased property and erected offices at a cost of \$84,000. In the summer of this year they were happy to

report a mortgage burning ceremony that was enjoyed by all of the members. Brother Jack White reported further they had consummated negotiations in this area for a three-year contract terminating in 1961.

The Retail Clerks in the Kern County area reports the expiration of their contract as of December 31, 1958. They filed the proper papers for the opening of negotiations, which they are in the process of doing at the present time. They also reported that they were able to hold on to approximately the same number of members as in the past, and that considerable progress has been made throughout the organization. The Retail Clerks also purchased an office building at a total cost of \$55,000.

Organizing

Considerable activity in organizing was shown by almost all of the unions in this district. Since the early part of 1958, with the qualifying of Proposition 18 for the November ballot, there has been a considerable lessening in organizational efforts throughout the district, with heavy concentration by practically all of the unions in combating the "right to work" measure.

I am happy to report that throughout the district there has been very good cooperation among all of the affiliates and a good job done by all. Considerable organizing in the early part of 1958 was done in the Inyo and Mono Counties area, particularly in the building trades, with a six months' concentrated drive in this area. I am happy to report that practically every licensed contractor is signatory to the proper agreements.

One of the outstanding successful efforts was with the Bonham Enterprises, Mr. Bonham being one of the larger general contractors here and also owner of the Dow Hotel and Motel. The organizing of this firm is a very good illustration of cooperation on the part of all of the affiliates in this area, as without the assistance of the motion picture industry, this would have been nearly impossible.

A heavy concentration by the Retail Clerks and Amalgamated Meat Cutters in an organizational attempt in the city of Taft met with minimum success.

District No. 50 has been encountered apparently throughout the district, but we have been able to keep them within a small area in Fresno County. The encroachment of District No. 50 is a great threat and all of the affiliates are very cognizant of this danger.

In closing, I wish to state that it has been a privilege and an honor to serve as your vice president for District No. 6, and I want to thank all those who made it possible for me to serve.

I also want to thank the officers of the State Federation for their help and advice whenever it was needed.

And in conclusion, I wish to congratulate the officers for the fine work they have done in the capacity of president and secretary-treasurer of the State Federation of Labor, Brothers Thomas L. Pitts, C. J. Haggerty, and the entire staff.

Respectfully and fraternally submitted,

H. D. LACKEY.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT C. AL. GREEN FOR DISTRICT No. 7

(San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Mariposa, Tuolumne, Calaveras and Alpine Counties)

Modesto, November 1, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the

California State Federation of Labor—
Greetings:

As vice president of District No. 7, I am happy to report that we have had progress in our unions. Several newly chartered unions have come into existence in the district since my last report: Fire Fighters, Glass Bottle Blowers, Machinists (Johns Manville, Stockton), Rubber Workers (Mohawk rubber plant, Stockton), County Housing Authority Workers (covering Manteca, Tracy, Stockton and Modesto).

Several unions have reported gains in membership. There has been the usual amount of transfers who follow work around the state, and the usual amount of incoming craftsmen when the type of work they seek in our valley is open.

At this writing, of course, the program is "all-out efforts for political work." All unions have participated these past few months getting everybody registered and a heavy stress has been laid on the program to get out the vote this coming Tuesday, November 4. I do not believe there has ever been as much interest shown in getting our voters interested in the measures as in this year. In my last report I

stated that apathy and indifference had diminished in the previous several months. This year I feel it is completely gone. More non-union citizens have contacted us regarding the candidates and measures to be voted upon than ever before.

Many dinners, picnics, entertainment programs, were successful this year in getting the crowds out to hear our candidates. At no time were the crowds disappointing. This proves "apathy and indifference" has gone by the wayside.

Community Service

Our union representatives are still being asked to become members of the various boards of our towns' charitable, educational, youth and welfare programs. Nearly every public, city and county organization has some union members active in them. Many of the entertainment programs find our Musicians Union donating freely of their services. Many of their buildings, including public school buildings, find hundreds of hours of work being donated by the building trades craftsmen, both at Stockton and Modesto especially.

The councils have donated books to the high school and college libraries which deal with the merits and benefits of organized labor. These schools also receive free of charge for their libraries the weekly labor newspapers. Every year the students contact the central labor councils for material from which they can write compositions or term papers about labor.

Stanislaus County Central Labor Council

Two new affiliates this year are the Modesto City Fire Fighters and the Glass Bottle Blowers. The latter started with around 104 members last May and as of last month they had 149 members. This union is employed by Gallo Bros., who built this glass bottle plant this summer at Modesto.

Retail Clerks Union

For the first time, my area has had a department store unionized when Montgomery Ward stores at Modesto, Turlock and Madera were successfully organized by the Retail Clerks in each respective area, aided by their International organizers. This was a long pull, but was settled within a few weeks' time.

The Clerks local in Stockton won a court decision in February in a case where a Lodi market was asking for injunctive re-

lief and damages. The Clerks had placed a picket on the Mar Val Market and the market felt it was entitled to damages. The Clerks' representatives showed in court that the Lodi Independent Grocery Workers Union was actually a company union controlled by the plaintiff. It was proved that this union was formed hastily in anticipation of an organizing attempt by the Clerks. A relative of the owners was president of the group, and belonging was a pre-requisite for holding a job. Because of these factors, the judge found that the plaintiff was not entitled to the relief sought.

Stockton Teachers Federation

A three months' battle for a dues check-off system for the members of the Stockton Teachers Federation was won in March when County Counsel Richard Dickenson reversed an earlier opinion on the matter.

Construction Activity, San Joaquin County

A building pick-up in San Joaquin County was announced in March by Howard Gibson of the Stockton Building Trades Council. Stokely-Van Camp, Inc., was to start a \$280,000 expansion plan. In the planning stage in the early part of April was an enlarged sewer plant. Bids for the new Stockton Port office were to be accepted around April 14 at a cost of around \$200,000. Eleven farm groups had formed plans to build a new cherry processing industry. The cooperative was to brine, pit and stem cherries.

Anniversary of Labor Temple

April ended the first year for the newly built Labor Center in Stockton. This temple was built by the Operating Engineers Local No. 3. The building is modern, one-story. About 25 tenants are renting office space. The building also contains a barber shop, a restaurant, a club room, three meeting halls and an auditorium capable of holding about 650 people. It is a building labor can well be proud to show.

"The House That Students Built"

During Stockton College's Open House in April, one of the main attractions, for the third year, was the house built by students from the various trade classes. With the exception of the linoleum work, everything has been done by student workers. These houses are built under the sponsorship of the San Joaquin County Apprenticeship Council and with the approval of labor and management groups in the Stockton area.

Apprentices

Both Modesto and Stockton held their annual Apprentice Completion Ceremonies this year again with some one hundred apprentices receiving their certificates. This salute to apprentices is looked forward to by many each year. Labor, management, educational and state representatives all share in this worthy program.

LLPE

The LLPE, also known as COPE, of course, both in Stanislaus and San Joaquin have continued the many, many hours of donated time and energy to keep the ball rolling for the coming election on November 4. The primaries showed gratifying results, but it was stressed constantly not to take a too affirmative view or an "in the bag" attitude as there still remained a lot of work to be done to bring everyone into the eligible-to-vote class. The labor press has done a remarkable job in bringing the facts and statistics and pictures to the rank and file members.

Modesto Electrical Code

A new electrical code was adopted by the city of Modesto in January. Its major change is that electricians who do business within the city must be certified as to their competency. A board of electrical examiners appointed by the council will handle the program. Two electrical contractors, two journeymen and a representative of the chief building inspector will comprise the membership of this board.

Teamsters' Medical Fund

Teamsters at Modesto paid members \$20,000 in medical care in 366 cases in one month. This certainly proves the value of the fund.

This union's office is still the blood-donating center every Thursday for the union members and the public as well.

The Stanislaus LLPE has received great help from the Teamsters in furthering the work of registering and processing the voters to the polls. Wendel J. Kiser is tireless in his efforts in LLPE, along with Wynn C. Plank of the Retail Clerks. They are to be commended for their leadership in this work.

Visiting Nurses

Labor backed the Visiting Nurse Association at its annual dinner in January.

This is a little known agency of the United Crusade which provided almost \$9,000 worth of services to the people of Stanislaus County. Operating with one full-time nurse and two part-time nurses, 9,975.8 miles were reportedly traveled in making 2,143 calls to their patients in Stanislaus County.

New Constitution

The Central Labor Council adopted new by-laws this year to conform with the merger of the AFL-CIO.

Auxiliaries

The Electrical Workers and the Carpenters Ladies Auxiliaries have been very active this year. Their meetings are held regularly. Many charitable acts were performed by them, and they showed a real interest in politics this year. In wanting to learn about the friendly-to-labor candidates, they held a special dinner-meeting for members and friends and secured a representative of national COPE to address their audience regarding candidates and the meaning of a "right to work" law.

Negotiations

In contract negotiations this year, no losses have been reported to me. This is gratifying. Many gains were reported in the way of paid vacations, and in some cases pension plans have had a start.

Unions and Union Members

Another successful ball was put on by the Modesto Musicians Local. This is an annual event around Washington's Birthday. Four halls are used and every type of music furnished. The benefits of the dance go to the Musicians Benevolent Fund. Music is furnished several times a year to the inmates of the State Hospital by the local union at Modesto. Under a trust fund grant, the Stanislaus County 4-H Club Council held a dance with music provided by members of this union.

An annual deep-sea fishing party is held each year by the members of Plumbers No. 437. Weeks of planning make this a great success every year. This year's trip was made to Santa Cruz.

A regrettable note is the resignation of Clyde Farlin, long-time business agent and "walking delegate," as he calls himself sometimes, from the Modesto Sign Painters. Clyde's health and the advice of his physician made it mandatory that he start taking life a little easier. Everybody is

sorry to see him leave. He has moved to Montana, whence he came, and he is already being missed by his fellow members and friends. It is hoped by all that he will recover his health and return to Modesto.

Frank J. Russo, vice president of the Labor Council and member of Laborers' No. 1130, can be found on any committee that requires plenty of work throughout the year. I have never known him to say no when it comes to voluntary donation of his time, cooperation and work for the betterment of the labor movement and the young people. Frank is also president of the Modesto Baseball for Boys, which program owes much to Frank J. Russo.

Early in the year George Gibson celebrated his 90th birthday. George is the father of Howard Gibson, who for many years has held the office of business agent for the Building Trades Council at Stockton. Four sons and their families held the celebration with him. The Senior Gibson was a charter member of Painters No. 274 (now No. 1115) and served as its representative for the Building Trades Council from 1900 to 1905. At 90 he is still an active man, doing his own shopping, and taking trips to visit his son Clair in Albany or relatives in Lockeford. He has, in addition to his four sons, six grandchildren and twelve great-grandchildren.

Upon the resignation of W. J. Kiser as secretary-treasurer of the Modesto Central Labor Union, over 300 people honored him with a surprise (it was!) testimonial dinner in Modesto. He was presented with a gift and a scroll of the signatures of all the participants in attendance. Perhaps another big surprise to him was the fact that his entire family and relatives all kept it a secret, and they showed up in a body only minutes after Kiser's own lone arrival. Many non-union citizens were present at the testimonial dinner, which makes us all proud of our good union brother, Wendel J. Kiser.

The Labor Council gave a new jigsaw

to an orphans' home for boys near Ceres. The jigsaw was the result of donations from certain locals affiliated with the council. The Cannery Workers at Modesto gave cash Christmas awards to many of their members amounting to a total of \$2000.

Entertainment, refreshments, and Santa Claus gifts to the children were in order through the Culinary Workers, the Electrical Workers, and the Carpenters.

Appointments

Lena Abrew, business agent for County Employees No. 183, was appointed a trustee of the Stockton State Hospital by Governor Goodwin J. Knight.

Henry Hansen has had a very busy year. He was appointed to the San Joaquin County Housing Authority to fill the vacancy left by the death of Frank W. Conway. Aside from his duties as secretary of the Central Labor Council, he serves on the Citizens Housing Committee, the City Planning Commission, the executive board of the County Safety Council, Stockton Committee of 100, the Community Youth Council, the Stockton Fund Review Committee, the 6th Army Advisory Committee, and as secretary of the County Labor League for Political Education.

In closing, I wish to thank every one of you, personally, for the fine cooperation I have received from you whenever making contact with you as vice president of District No. 7. I could not ask for better.

Finally, my thanks and appreciation to our hard-working secretary-treasurer, C. J. Haggerty, who has always stood ready to help and advise whenever the occasion arose.

Best of health and happiness to all the delegates at this 1958 convention!

Faternally yours in UNION,

C. AL. GREEN.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT THOMAS A. SMALL FOR DISTRICT No. 8

(San Mateo, Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties)

San Mateo, November 18, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—
Greetings:

Continued progress—economically and in growth and gains of local unions—is the

keynote of this year's report for District Eight.

Gains Throughout District

Word from Santa Clara County, which has attracted international attention for its tremendous growth in population, in-

dustry and home building, is that building permits are averaging five million dollars a week still—an indication that building craftsmen will have work for some time to come erecting the industrial plants, the homes, stores, schools and other facilities for the workers.

This record growth applies all over this district, too, for there have been many gains recorded from San Mateo County, Santa Clara County, Monterey County, and even from San Benito County, where unions still tread lightly.

Political Activity

I wish I could be as positive and optimistic about the political activity of our district labor unions. Unfortunately, this district seems to be a Republican stronghold. While we won decisive votes against "right to work," we watched Republican candidates eke out narrow-margin wins throughout the district. As compared to the state Democratic sweep, the local candidate record wasn't good.

Our labor political units have been asked to start re-grouping and to begin thinking of 1960 elections. Maybe the Democratic Party will realize some changes are needed, too, and the 1960 elections will find friendly-to-labor candidates winning in this district.

We did elect some Republican candidates who had been outspoken in behalf of the cause of labor, but obviously these were out of step with the state Democratic victories.

San Benito "Right to Work" Ordinance

I remarked that union leaders "tread lightly" in San Benito County. It was here that the unions were unsuccessful in preventing enactment of a "right to work" county law. Court action subsequently resulted in a ruling that the law was unconstitutional, but the State Supreme Court, on its own initiative, suspended the ruling and decided to review the whole "right to work" legal picture. With the "on again, off again" legal status regarding the law, union officials have been cautious in San Benito County. The Carmel "right to work" law has not been tested as of this writing, although the law is more than a year old.

"Right to Work" Campaign and Elections

Before I get off the subject of "right to work" and Proposition 18, I want to com-

mend the labor unions and labor people for their efficient organization and sound campaigning against this law. Big public rallies were held all over the district. There were billboards, signs, radio programs, TV programs and announcements, speakers at civic meetings, and generally a solid effort to expose the misinformation about this anti-labor law. It was a terrific job, showing just what labor can do when aroused.

I was pleased at the registration campaigns in all the district this year. Labor's efforts to register its people and then get them to the polls certainly was a success.

New Union Headquarters

There are some new "monuments" to labor in the district. The big Culinary Union in San Jose has a beautiful new meeting hall and headquarters. An addition was constructed to enlarge the San Jose Labor Temple, and the Musicians Union there is starting a building of its own.

In Watsonville, the Labor Temple is moved out of "town and country" into the downtown area, for better service to union people. San Mateo's new Auto Mechanics building is an attractive asset to the community and the labor movement.

Conventions

Labor has continued to help in drawing major conventions to the district. Notable among such conventions was the American Newspaper Guild's 25th anniversary international convention in San Jose. Monterey got the big State Council of Carpenters' convention and the State Labor Press Conference.

The effort to bring conventions to the district seems to be centralized in San Jose and Monterey, but with changes in the Hotel and Restaurant Union in the Santa Cruz area now showing results, there is a move for revival of Santa Cruz as a convention city. You will remember that labor has frowned on conventions in Santa Cruz because of lack of union hotels and other facilities. Perhaps that non-union position of the city's business interests is being broken down a bit now.

Assistance to Students

There has been a broadening of thinking by unions in the matter of helping young people advance their education. From the State Federation's beginning with its three state scholarships, this district now has added labor council scholarship programs in San Jose, Salinas, and

San Mateo, Hodcarrier Union scholarships in San Jose, Carpenter scholarships in San Mateo, and others not specifically listed but given good support by labor unions. It's a good thing to see these high school students brighten up as they receive their checks to help pay costs of college.

In the field of helping students, something new has been started in San Jose. The Building Trades Council and the Butchers Union have been allowing San Jose State College students to take an "internship" in offices of the organizations. The students come in, learn about finances, handling of grievances, organizing, welfare programs, and so on—by actually working in the office, and making trips into the field. One such "intern" student was allowed to participate in an actual arbitration proceeding. Do you think he'll forget this, and the successful union position?

Public and Community Relations

In the field of public relations, San Jose's labor movement has continued its fine radio programs, conducted by Bill Pedigo. This area became the first in the state to have regular labor radio programs in 1951. The current series started in November, 1954—going into five years of successful public relations via radio.

But public relations efforts aren't restricted to radio by any means. The fine work done by union workmen, who donated work to erect the San Mateo Boys Club and similar projects all over the district, is a credit to the tradesmen.

San Jose continued to sponsor its unique "Kite Day" for the youngsters, working in conjunction with the city recreation department. There were numerous summertime and Christmas parties lined up for kiddies as well as adults connected with unions.

Union label promotion councils had excellent booths at county fairs in San Mateo and San Jose, and there was a labor booth also in the Santa Cruz County Fair in Watsonville this year.

Safety programs were given labor sup-

port. An investigation into substandard building on government-financed housing projects was launched. Efforts were made in two counties to get the University of California to establish new branch units. Civic projects were supported with unusual vigor.

Visitors from Chile and Europe

A delegation of labor leaders from the Republic of Chile was in San Jose to meet with Ted Lopez and get information about labor union contracts in food processing, the only labor session the Chilean cannery operators held in their tour of the U. S. And, as usual, labor played host to many "exchange" visiting labor leaders from European countries, with the guests attending various labor functions all over the district.

New Names and Faces

Economic gains were recorded by all unions in this district much the same as elsewhere. There were normal changes in leadership reported, and the new faces in the labor movement have rapidly become well known and accepted—and fitted into their proper place in the solid foundation of our unions.

With a district this large, it's hard to note every item of interest and importance. Probably some major events and personalities have not been mentioned here for various reasons. If so, I am sorry. Certainly no intentional slight is meant to anyone or any project.

Serving the area has been a great pleasure to me, particularly this past year with the unusual activity in the election and in the unprecedented growth recorded. It has been a distinct honor to represent this area as vice president of the Federation.

So, with wishes for a successful convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, I submit this as my report of District Eight for the past year.

Fraternally submitted,

THOMAS A. SMALL.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT MORRIS WEISBERGER FOR DISTRICT No. 9A

(San Francisco)

San Francisco, November 10, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—

Greetings:

My report to the 1957 convention was dated July 6, 1957. Therefore this report covers an eventful sixteen months.

The maritime industry has had its ups and downs and the trend in recent years has been a long decline, punctuated by a few, relatively short-lived upturns.

Formerly an important part of American commerce, many ships in the coastwise and intercoastal trades were commandeered by the government during World War II. The ship companies lost that business to the trucks and railroads and the customers never returned. However, it is predicted that the increase in carrying truck trailers aboard ship may revive much of this discontinued ocean-going traffic.

During the period covered by this report the seafaring unions have had serious unemployment, intensified by the general slump in world shipping and increased competition in the trans-Pacific trade by British and Japanese companies. Nevertheless, union conditions relating to wages, hours and working rules have not only been maintained but improved. This includes the licensed officers' unions.

The three unions (Sailors, Firemen and Stewards) comprising the Pacific District of the Seafarers International have negotiated a new three-year contract with the Pacific Maritime Association and subsequently with companies not affiliated with the Association.

The Pacific District has wages and conditions that are the highest in the world. The three unions have merged their vacation plan and the new schedule provides three days' vacation for every 30 days worked. This is a vast improvement over the old plan which allowed eight days' vacation for seven months worked.

In addition, there are improvements in working rules as well as increases in holidays, subsistence, transportation and lodging.

China-Formosa Bonus

As on previous occasions when American merchant ships were subjected to the hazards of armed conflict, the three Pacific Seafarers unions, in conjunction with the two licensed officers' unions (Deck and Engine), obtained a bonus when under attack in certain defined waters off the China Coast, together with other protection when the ship is under attack while in harbor.

The bonus agreement which went into effect September 5, 1958, provides:

100 per cent bonus in certain waters off the China Coast and in and around

Formosa to within 12 miles east of Formosa.

\$100 harbor attack bonus and \$150 vessel attack bonus in area covered by 100 per cent bonus, if either harbor or vessel is directly attacked.

\$10,000 insurance to cover loss of life and disability provided for each member of the crew employed on and aboard such a vessel while in waters covered by the 100 per cent bonus.

Cooperation in Pensions and Welfare

The year was marked by increased cooperation and closer working relations between the three unions—SUP (Sailors), MFOU (Firemen) and MC&S (Stewards)—comprising the Pacific District of the Seafarers International Union of North America. On every possible level, the three organizations have coordinated their efforts and activities with a view to bringing maximum benefits to their membership. This includes a decision to combine the bi-weekly papers now issued separately by the three unions.

As reported to the Oakland convention, the three unions voted for a merger of pension funds. This has been accomplished, and on November 1, 1957, all pensioners received a 25 per cent increase. On October 1, 1958, the three unions had 627 pensioners.

The welfare plan has also been enlarged by providing medical and hospital benefits to wives and children of eligible members. This is a much appreciated service since the seamen's earnings have enabled an ever increasing percentage of the membership to enter the state of matrimony. Another improvement in the welfare plan was made by increasing payments to temporarily disabled members.

Last but not least, the three unions have authorized a study of merging of the welfare plan, also a study of a proposed joint union-shipowner pre-shipping medical examination to provide a uniform, standard test of physical fitness.

Problems of the American Merchant Marine

The recent session of Congress failed to solve problems which are harassing the American Merchant Marine. The Magnuson bill, S 1488, restricting foreign transfers, was endorsed at last year's convention but had no action. In the meantime, certain American shipowners have continued to avail themselves of the wide-open opportunities to avoid taxation, to

evade our labor laws, and to operate under substandard conditions, by adopting so-called "flags of convenience" and transferring their vessels to foreign registry, such as Liberia, Panama and Honduras.

The one bright spot is a decision by the National Labor Relations Board that an American-owned company with ships under foreign registry is still under its control with respect to labor relations when in American ports.

Another problem is the continued operation of the Military Sea Transportation Service which has observed its tenth anniversary as one of the largest government-supported agencies competing with U. S. private industry. Congressional studies of the agency's operations show its costs have run higher than for private ships, both tanker and dry cargo, in the same trade.

Last year's convention, at the instance of affiliated seafarers' unions, joined in protesting such unfair competition with private industry. However, the MSTS is currently operating more than a hundred ships and is in no small part accountable for the dwindling cargoes available to privately-owned ships endeavoring to carry on under such a handicap. So our protests should continue.

Finally, there is the puzzling policy of our national diplomacy. As a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, we prohibit our merchant ships from calling at Red China. As a member of the Coordinating Committee on Export Control, our diplomats agree it is okeh for other nations to do so. In plain language, our policy seems to be to keep our ships at home and build a merchant marine for every competing nation.

Training and Recreation

In last year's report reference was made to the ambitious plans of the Marine Cooks and Stewards' Union to establish a recreation and training center on a 350-acre site near Santa Rosa in Sonoma County.

On June 14, 1958, the union sponsored the formal opening of the beautiful center when more than 500 visitors gathered on the premises to inspect the union's accomplishment and pay tribute to a practical and humanitarian enterprise approved by labor and management.

Plans are now being perfected to provide cabins for retired members of the Sailors, Firemen and Stewards Unions at the Santa Rosa site.

Secretary Ed Turner called attention to the fact that the center is restricted to

only those connected with the Pacific District unions and contract steamship companies. There is no intention of competing with the commercial resorts in the area and the center is not a profit-making setup.

Fishermen and Fish Cannery Workers

Our affiliated fishermen throughout California have had an exceptionally good year compared to the past five or six years. Heavy imports of tuna priced our tuna fishermen practically out of business. This situation has changed a little for the better and our tuna fishermen worked fairly steady this year.

Our sardine fishermen in Monterey and San Pedro are doing much better money-wise than the previous few years. It appears that the sardines are fast coming back to our California coast, and it now looks like the 1958 catch shall exceed 100,000 tons.

The long-standing campaign of disruption and raiding conducted by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union against our affiliated Seine & Line Fishermen's Union of San Pedro, SIU-AFL-CIO, finally brought about an election under the auspices of the National Labor Relations Board which tallied 193 for our union and 117 for Local 33, ILWU.

Our affiliated fish cannery workers have received wage increases of approximately 10 cents per hour on a statewide basis since our last convention and were forced to hit the bricks for 30 days by only one company in Terminal Island; namely, Coast Fishing Company, Division of Quaker Oats.

Lundeberg Memorial Monument

To honor the memory of Harry Lundeberg, late secretary-treasurer of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific and vice president of the State Federation of Labor, a bronze bust was dedicated in an auspicious ceremony on January 28, 1958, the first anniversary of Lundeberg's death.

It was placed in front of the San Francisco headquarters building facing the statue of Andrew Furuseth, which had been moved from its site at the Ferry Building to make way for a new freeway. The Lundeberg monument bears the inscription: "He was indeed a man who crowded into a short life no glittering promise but unselfish service and general achievement for the cause he called his own."

First Wine Tank Ship

During the year the first wine tank ship, the Angelo Petri, carrying 2,412,000 gallons of California wine, sailed from San Francisco to the East Coast with a 100 per cent union crew.

On the return trip the ship is carrying liquid edibles and drinkables such as beverage alcohol.

Hawaiian Sugar Strike

A four months old strike of Hawaiian sugar workers was settled on June 6 by a compromise agreement. The seafaring unions did not become involved, but at the outset of the strike gave assurance that, notwithstanding past and present differences with the independent International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, nothing would be done to assist the plantation owners to break the strike.

California Has Few Harbors

In contrast to the Atlantic Coast, the Pacific Coast has but few harbors and San Francisco is the only harbor in California where practically the entire waterfront, including wharves and the Belt Line Railroad, is owned by the state and under the jurisdiction of a port authority. It has been traditional that one of the five members constituting the authority should be a labor member. Having been tendered the unsolicited appointment by Governor Knight, your vice president accepted in the belief that his service on the authority would have a tendency to further satisfactory labor relations and thus benefit the maritime industry.

While the ports of San Francisco and Los Angeles are maintaining their leadership with respect to the turn-over of tonnage, two northern river ports—Sacramento and Stockton—have become ambitious rivals. Sacramento is advocating dredging of the river to enable direct calls by deepwater ships.

Stockton, already a deepwater port, has a two million dollar program to double the port's ore-handling facilities.

These developments have the active support of all the seafaring unions since it will stabilize transportation of Western products and provide more permanent employment to our members.

For Safety of Life at Sea

Washington hearings by the House Merchant Marine Committee have judged the American Merchant Marine to be the safest afloat. Comparison of safety standards on American flag ships and those of other nations have shown that the U. S. merchant fleet is subject to much more rigid safety requirements than ships of other nations.

The organized American seafarers have made a substantial contribution in bringing forth these higher standards. For this reason it seemed a duty to accept appointment as a member of a committee which will function preparatory to an International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea to be held in the spring of 1960.

It is a privilege to render service for greater safety of life at sea to the end that our safety requirements may become universal for the ships of all nations.

Conclusion

From the point of view of the organized seafarers, the outstanding result of the recent California election is the overwhelming defeat of Proposition 18, misnamed "Right to Work."

In the State of Washington a similar measure, known as Initiative 202, met a like fate.

In both states the seafaring unions were vitally concerned in the rejection of these union-crushing proposals and contributed financially as well as otherwise toward their defeat.

Altogether it has been a hectic year, and aside from my normal duties as secretary-treasurer of the Sailors Union of the Pacific, it has been an honor and a privilege to give my available time to a really progressive State Federation of Labor.

Fraternally submitted,

MORRIS WEISBERGER.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT ARTHUR F. DOUGHERTY FOR DISTRICT No. 9B

(San Francisco)

San Francisco, October 25, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—

Greetings:

As we approach the 56th convention of the California State Federation of Labor

I am reminded that it will be the last convention under the banner of the American Federation of Labor. That the merger will be successful I am confident, once again uniting all of labor under one roof, the AFL and the CIO. May I express my appreciation and thanks to the members of the merger committee for a job well done.

Union Activity and Service

As vice president of the Ninth District, representing many unions, I could relate numerous incidents that make up the trials and tribulations of the state labor movement during 1958. I am privileged to represent my own Hotel and Restaurant local in San Francisco with a combined membership of some 24,000.

The problems of these unions since our last convention, are similar in all respects to those of the rest of the other unions of the Ninth District. Their activities in the economic, civic, social and cultural life of our state have been many. They have proudly served in the public interest in many fields of endeavor. Their record of public service to the community in civil defense, the United Crusade, heart and cancer drives, March of Dimes, boys clubs, churches, schools and the like, is excellent. Of this record we are proud.

Unity Against Attack

The Ninth District has demonstrated a willingness to participate with the rest of the labor movement in all of the problems confronting the some 1,500,000 union members of our state. This is evidenced by the cooperation given to the State Federation of Labor in its fight to preserve the labor movement against restrictive labor laws. Not since 1944 has the labor movement united into one front when the anti-labor forces have plagued our unions for the sole purpose of destroying them. However, men of good will shall prevail and the united labor movement shall go forward to greater heights. Organized labor can and will emerge stronger than ever and establish even more firmly the place of organized labor in the hearts and minds of our citizens.

Joint Board Negotiations

During the months of July, August, September and October of 1958, the San Francisco Local Joint Executive Board and its affiliated unions have been faced with reopenings in four of the major collective bargaining agreements, namely: the Hotel Employers Association of San Francisco, the San Francisco Club Institute,

the Golden Gate Restaurant Association, and the San Francisco Hotel Owners Association.

The Hotel Employers Association of San Francisco, representing all of the major hotels of our city, were the first group with whom the unions exchanged proposals and commenced negotiations, and after some eight and one-half weeks of continuous negotiations an agreement was reached, and a memorandum agreement was signed covering some 4000 members of our unions.

The agreement reached by the unions and the hotel operators once again demonstrated that men of good will will find the answers if there is a willingness to make the search. The pact was accomplished by voluntary negotiations, without resort to compulsory arbitration provided by the former contract between the parties, and provided for a 4½ per cent wage increase commencing with January 1, 1959, and another 4 per cent increase commencing with January 1, 1960, for all employees. In addition to this, many changes in working conditions were negotiated, particularly, for the first time the members will have remedy under the agreement for unjust discharge.

Union Shop Extended

The agreement reached provided for an extension of the agreement until July 1, 1963. The union shop provisions in effect in the hotels for many years by voluntary agreement were extended for the full term of the agreement, even in the face of the so-called "right to work" Proposition No. 18 on the November ballot, demonstrating to the public that employers and unions should be free to enter into agreements without restrictive labor laws, and particularly demonstrating that there is no need in California for so-called "right to work" propositions.

Labor - Management Relations

I am more than satisfied with the manner in which the bargaining was conducted. The unions cannot stress enough the advantages which both sides, as well as the public, derive from such peaceful and voluntary methods of working out labor-management problems. Labor and management in the hotel industry have developed mature leadership over the years and have conducted themselves overwhelmingly in a responsible and trustworthy manner. I hope that the freedom of the hotels and the unions in the future to make labor contracts in the best interests of the San Francisco hotel industry

and the traveling public will not be interfered with by restrictive labor laws.

Restaurant Negotiations

The unions are presently in negotiations with the Golden Gate Restaurant Association, and after some eight meetings a deadlock exists. At this time of writing no change has developed. I am certain, however, the unions affiliated with the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union will make every effort to further their cause and gain improvements in the working conditions of their members.

Club Institute Agreement

On October 15, 1958, an agreement was reached with the San Francisco Club Institute, employing some 1000 members of our unions in the private membership clubs. The agreement reached provides among other things, a 4½ per cent wage increase, effective February 1, 1959; a 4 per cent wage increase, effective February 1, 1960, and an extension of the union shop provision until August 1, 1963, with annual reopenings commencing with August 1, 1960, for wages and fringe issues.

Arbitration if Necessary

The outcome of the Golden Gate Restaurant Association and the San Francisco Hotel Owners Association at this time is unknown. No doubt an agreement will eventually be reached. In the event the deadlock cannot be broken, all matters in dispute will be referred to arbitration in accordance with the provisions of the agreement.

Proposition 18

When the convention convenes in San Francisco the outcome of Proposition 18 will be known. It is the sincere belief of our unions in the Ninth District that the proposition will be soundly beaten and labor once again shall be free to pursue its aims to improve the standards of living for the wage earners of our state.

In closing, to the unions of the Ninth District, thanks for the wonderful cooperation afforded me since the last convention; it is a privilege to serve you.

Fraternally submitted,

ARTHUR DOUGHERTY.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT JACK GOLDBERGER FOR DISTRICT No. 9C (San Francisco)

San Francisco, November 14, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—
Greetings:

Local Merger

The San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO, came into being on Friday night, September 5, when some 300 delegates from former AFL and former CIO local unions took the obligation from Dan Flanagan, regional director of the AFL-CIO, and gave formal approval to the final steps that merged the two labor groups into one city council.

The merger brought into the new council 122 local unions that made up the old AFL body, and 16 additional local unions which had comprised the former CIO Industrial Union Council.

The final steps of the merger saw the delegates approve modification of the old AFL Labor Council constitution and by-laws to make room for former CIO representatives on three major committees, and the substitution of "AFL-CIO" for "AFL" wherever it is found in the document.

The merger agreement also provided for extension of the terms of office of all

council officers and committees, as reconstituted, until January, 1960.

Teamster Withdrawal

Delegates from twenty-three unions of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters left the San Francisco Labor Council this April under a direct mandate from AFL-CIO President George Meany.

They left, however, with repeated assurances of continued cooperation with the local labor movement. The Labor Council, in turn, praised its long relationship with the Teamsters and expressed its hope "for a continuation of the unity and cooperation that has always existed in San Francisco, despite any required changes in our organization.

Delegates and onlookers packed the Labor Temple auditorium in anticipation of action on the direct order from Meany to comply not later than April 1 with the AFL-CIO directive ordering central labor bodies to disaffiliate local unions of the ousted Teamsters.

A labor council resolution—unanimously recommended by its executive committee (with Teamster members abstaining from voting)—interpreted Meany's notice

as making final the disaffiliation of the Teamster locals.

But the resolution noted that, in expelling the Teamsters on charges of "corrupt influences, the Atlantic City convention made no charges in any form against the San Francisco locals of the Teamsters. It also cited finding of the AFL-CIO appeals committee that "no one contends that all of the 5,000 local officers and 1,400,000 members of the Teamsters Union are corrupt."

"The Labor movement of San Francisco does not hesitate," the resolution said, "to point with pride at the clean, honest and sincere efforts made by all of our local unions, including the Teamsters on behalf of the working people of this city."

Citing the "many years of friendly and cooperative relationships," the Council resolution declared, "It is the hope and desire of every delegate to this Council that we shall be able to continue this warm relationship through working together in a joint effort to maintain the unity and integrity of this labor movement."

Labor Press Advertising Ethics Code

It was my honor to serve as chairman of the California State Federation of Labor's committee investigating charges of advertising abuses within the labor press of the state.

The committee discovered, after hearings in both Los Angeles and San Francisco, that virtually all of the reported abuses involved persons not in any manner connected with the organized labor movement of the state.

The State Federation committee was comprised of the following: Vice Presidents Jack Goldberger, Lowell Nelson and Thomas A. Small.

Our reported code recommendations were unanimously adopted by the State Federation of Labor Convention held September 16-20, 1957, in Oakland. Our new code follows:

(1) Officially endorsed publications shall serve the best interests of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations and uphold the high ideals of the AFL-CIO Constitution at all times.

(2) Officially endorsed publications shall plainly and prominently publish in each issue an accurate statement of ownership and endorsement.

(3) Officially endorsed publications shall not represent either in their publications or in the promotion or sale of adver-

tising that they are endorsed by the national or state AFL-CIO.

(4) Officially endorsed publications shall not, knowingly, solicit, accept or publish advertising from any firm against which a strike or lockout is in progress or from any firm on an unfair list duly established in accord with the national AFL-CIO Constitution.

(5) Officially endorsed publications shall not solicit or accept local advertising from outside their predominant area of circulation. This does not apply to national advertising.

(6) Officially endorsed publications shall not employ high-pressure telephone solicitors or accept or publish advertising obtained through such methods.

(7) Officially endorsed publications shall make no claim or suggestion directly or through salesmen that the purchase of advertising can accomplish anything for the advertiser beyond winning consumer acceptance or approval of the advertiser's product or services.

(8) Officially endorsed publications shall not associate themselves in any manner with the publication of any yearbook, directory or program that has for its primary purpose the solicitation of donations under the guise of selling advertising.

Machinists' Anniversary

San Francisco members of the International Association of Machinists this February joined in national celebrations of the union's 70th birthday with special meetings of the lodges.

Among local affiliates of the IAM sponsoring their anniversary programs were Lodge 1305, Automotive Machinists; Lodge 1327, Production Machinists; Machinists Lodge 68; Welders Lodge 1330 and other local units.

San Francisco radio station, KGO, carried a national broadcast of an IAM historical review of the union which featured William Holden, Marie McDonald and Brian Dunleavy, as well as a special anniversary message by IAM President Al Hayes.

Lundeberg Monument

Harry Lundeberg, late head of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific and the Seafarers' International Union, was honored this year by a bronze bust placed at the entrance to the SUP building at First and Harrison Streets, San Francisco.

The Lundeberg monument stands opposite a similar statue of Andrew Furuseth, another heroic leader of the SUP. Furuseth's statue formerly stood at the foot of

Market Street, but was moved to its position in front of the SUP building when the new freeway construction began on the Embarcadero.

Brother Lundeborg was executive officer of the SUP for twenty-one years, and served as vice president of the California State Federation of Labor for seventeen years.

Union Labor Party

Union Labor Party endorsements carried in the field in virtually all the 1958 primary and general election races. All candidates endorsed by the Union Labor Party for the June 3 primary, were successful in both the federal and state election fights.

In the November 4 election, the following Union Labor Party candidates were elected:

Edmund G. Brown for Governor, Clair Engle for U. S. Senator, Stanley Mosk for Attorney General, Glenn Anderson for Lieutenant Governor, Bert Betts for State Treasurer, and Alan Cranston for State Controller.

Successful endorsements on the district endorsement level were: John F. Shelley for Congress, 5th District; J. Eugene McAteer, for State Senate; Charles W. Meyers for 19th Assembly District; A. Phillip Burton for 20th Assembly District; John A. O'Connell for 23rd Assembly District; Edward M. Gaffney for 24th Assembly District; and George R. Reilly for Board of Equalization.

Labor-endorsed George Collins did not win in the 4th Congressional District fight, nor did Ruth Gupta in the 21st Assembly District, nor Frank Brann in the 22nd Assembly District.

Union Labor Party recommendations to the California Labor League for Political Education were accepted intact in both the pre-primary and pre-general election conventions of the CLLPE.

The Union Labor Party looks forward to continued success in municipal, state and federal election contests.

John Hogg

There was a happy homecoming held at

the Building Trades Temple this January, when Brother John L. Hogg, president of the San Francisco Building Trades Council and business representative of Carpenters No. 2164, came back to the Temple for the first time since he and his wife were injured in a near fatal auto crash last October.

Brother Hogg has been on the job since his return in January, much to the pleasure and satisfaction of his thousands of friends in the labor movement of San Francisco, and in the community itself.

New Carpenters Hall

Carpenters No. 483 this January opened a beautiful new headquarters building on Haight Street in San Francisco, following removal from their old headquarters on Valencia Street, which was torn down to make way for a new freeway.

It marked the second time in the local's history that the headquarters hall had to be destroyed for public improvements. Back in 1910, the local headquarters was established on the present site of the San Francisco City Hall.

Pre-Job Conference

San Francisco Building Trades unions nailed down 100 per cent union contracts with representatives of Swinerton & Walberg for construction of the new Bank of America at Market and Van Ness in conferences held this July.

A pre-job meeting of the San Francisco Building Trades Council and contractors resulted in the arrangement.

The union representatives were informed that safety committees will be set up, and safety would be heavily stressed in the major job operation.

In closing, I would like to express my sincere appreciation of the opportunity that has been mine since 1955 to serve the labor movement, not only in San Francisco, but throughout the state. I look forward to the day that we shall again have a united labor movement in California.

Faternally submitted,

JACK GOLDBERGER.

REPORT FOR DISTRICT No. 9 D

(San Francisco)

(Following the death on July 17, 1958, of Brother Harry W. Metz, vice president of District No. 9 (D), the executive council elected Brother Newell J. Carman, at its

meeting on August 24, to serve the remainder of Brother Metz' unexpired term. There is, therefore, no report to the convention from District No. 9D.)

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT ROBERT S. ASH FOR DISTRICT No. 10A**(Alameda County)**

Oakland, November 14, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—

Greetings:

As a result of the successful merger in Alameda County, this report clearly depicts the fact that our activities have increased to a great degree.

Education

The Central Labor Council of Alameda County, AFL-CIO, conducted a four-day leadership training conference which was held in Monterey. Over fifty business agents and international union representatives attended this conference.

Scheduling the conference away from Alameda County was done deliberately with one purpose in mind—to get the busy union representatives away from their regular duties to relax, listen and participate in the conference at hand, and then return refreshed and revitalized, prepared to put their new knowledge to work.

The conference program covered many subjects, such as: How to run a Political Campaign, How to Campaign on Issues, How Legislation is Enacted, How to Use Federal Mediation Service and State Conciliation Service, How to Organize, and the Legal Problems Encountered in Negotiations, Parliamentary Procedure, etc. At the graduation dinner the last panel discussed "How the Community Looks at Labor."

Health and Welfare Council

The Central Labor Council and the Building Trades Council of Alameda County have established the East Bay Labor and Welfare Council. This council acts as a clearing house for those local unions which have problems with health plans, hospitals or doctors.

It has also conducted several conferences in cooperation with the Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California in Berkeley. The most recent conference was one on "The Health of the Business Agent"—a conference on the life and times of the average American business agent, on the health problems associated with his craft, and the precautions he should take if the union is not to be deprived prematurely of his services. Subjects covered were: The Life and Times of the Business Agent, tobacco, tension, alcohol, and how should the business agent live.

This council has also published a pamphlet entitled "Medical Care and Rehabilitation Under Workmen's Compensation," by Leon Lewis, M. D.

Community Services

The Central Labor Council, through its Community Services Committee, conducted a union counseling course for business agents and stewards.

A nine-week course was designed to acquaint union officials with community welfare resources available to meet problems of union members so that they may refer members to agencies which can help them. The classes covered such matters as eligibility for public welfare assistance, and how to apply for workmen's compensation and unemployment insurance benefits; also, the referring of union members to family service and other social agencies. A graduation dinner was held for those who attended at least seven out of nine sessions. There were forty-nine who received diplomas for successfully completing the course. Director Richard A. McGee, State Department of Corrections, addressed the graduates and their guests. The Central Labor Council of Alameda County, AFL-CIO 1958 Community Service Award was presented to Clark Corliss "in recognition of his efforts to make Alameda County a better place to live."

We have participated in many conferences such as: AFL-CIO Community Services program in Washington, D. C.; Western Conference, United Funds and Councils, Sacramento; Grass Roots Conference, Alameda County; Alameda County Committee for Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency, Youth Employment Conference.

The Unemployment Insurance Committee has had several meetings with both local and state officials, thereby eliminating problems for some of our members and establishing a better working relationship with all levels of the California State Department of Employment.

Assistant Secretary Richard Groulx of the Central Labor Council is chairman of the East Bay Local Offices Advisory Committee on Minority Group Employment. This committee is sponsored by the California State Department of Employment.

Public Activities

The Central Labor Council was one of the prime movers working with other community groups for the passage of the tax increase for the Oakland school system.

Our first efforts encountered many hazards, including the heavy rains on election day. The school tax being the only issue on the ballot, many of our supporters remained away from the polls, causing the issue to be defeated. However, the delegates to the council suggested that we try once again because of the importance of this issue, so we asked the community groups to remain intact. The tax issue was then placed on the June primary ballot. Members of the Oakland Federation of Teachers No. 771 and School Employees No. 257 made many speaking engagements to explain the necessity of the tax increase. This time we were successful and we were able to go before the school board and demand the wage increases the tax issue provided for our people, teachers and custodians.

Alameda County Central Labor Council is well represented on many civic bodies and agencies by representatives from our affiliated locals, serving on fund-raising, Social Planning, Campfire Girls, Boy Scouts, Travelers Aid Society, Institutions Commission, Welfare Commission, school boards and city councils, to name a few. In fact, Assistant Secretary Arthur Helder participates in the monthly prep work classes at San Quentin Prison.

I have been serving on the Northern California Council of Churches with a few other labor representatives for the purpose of increasing the understanding between the church and the labor movement. It was heartwarming to me when the Council of Churches took a forthright position in opposing "right to work" Proposition 18.

Campaign Issues

The major efforts of our Central Labor Council during the past year were of course directed toward the defeat of the so-called "right to work" initiative, Proposition 18.

Beginning in November 1957, we engaged Dr. Fred Stripp, University of California debate coach, to assist us in establishing a speaker's bureau. Many of our representatives attended the classes conducted by Dr. Stripp and throughout the campaign addressed church groups, lodges, schools and civic organizations. We debated with proponents of the measure on several occasions, including three debates with Winton Caldwell, one of the measure's chief proponents. Members of the Speaker's Bureau also showed the three State Federation films to local unions and community organizations.

Our Central Labor Council conducted two voter registration drives. The pre-

primary drive concentrated on qualifying many union representatives and active members as deputy registrars and encouraging unions to register their own members. Then, beginning in August, we opened a fulltime COPE office manned by several fulltime employees and many volunteers to check union membership lists against county records to determine the unregistered union members. The names of these unregistered members were then distributed to our COPE registrars, who contacted and registered those eligible. In addition, we conducted several mass registration drives in heavily Democratic areas, chiefly in the 17th Assembly District. The success of these registration efforts, we feel, was very important in the final results of the election.

While Proposition 18 was still in its initiative stage, we organized teams of union members to cover employment offices, shopping centers and large department stores with leaflets urging people not to sign the "right to work" petitions. When it became obvious that the measure would qualify, the Central Labor Council and Building Trades Council engaged Don Wyatt and Associates to conduct our public relations campaign against "right to work" and established the Alameda County Citizens' Committee Against Proposition 18.

Through a series of newspaper advertisements, spot radio and TV announcements, quarter card displays, speaking engagements, etc., we did everything possible to bring our story to the public. The citizens' committee and our council solicited the volunteer services of hundreds of union members to aid us in distributing literature, bumper strips and other material. Teams were organized on a postal zone basis to distribute "right to work" material door to door. In addition to covering our own area, the council initiated several statewide ads to meet opposition material.

Coupled with this activity, we established precinct organizations in three of the county's six Assembly Districts and cooperated with other organizations in the remaining three to insure an effective countywide "Get Out the Vote" drive. Our volunteer workers made a concentrated effort in the 17th Assembly District. This district has a concentration of minority voters and was of particular interest to us because some deliberate attempts were made to confuse Proposition 18 with FEPC. Our precinct organization there resulted from interest aroused by speakers from our council talking before

church groups in that area. On September 2 we established a headquarters in a building donated to us by the Shipyard Laborers, Local 886.

With three fulltime office employees and the help of the Office Employees Union No. 29 and many clerical volunteers from other unions, walking lists and cards for each registered voter were prepared in each of the 259 precincts in the 17th Assembly District. A minimum of 2,000 hours were spent on clerical work alone in this district. In addition to this, the 17th Assembly District committee distributed 40,000 leaflets specifically directed toward 18's effect on civil rights; 50,000 COPE slate cards; 10,000 community paycheck pamphlets; 6,000 bumper strips and 15,000 miscellaneous leaflets on Proposition 18, as well as participating in county-wide distributions directed by the Citizens' Committee.

We also operated several sound trucks throughout the campaign. On election day our volunteers covered nearly every precinct on an intensive "Get Out the Vote" drive. The election results (excluding absentee ballots) were very rewarding. The vote in the 17th Assembly District shows 84.6 per cent against Proposition 18; 83.8 per cent for Brown and 72 per cent for Jeffery Cohelan, who was elected largely because of the vote in this district. We conducted similar drives in the 13th and 14th Assembly Districts.

Negotiations and Strikes

The Central Labor Council had an ac-

tive year in negotiations and strike assistance. One dispute involving Paint Makers No. 1101 and the C. K. Williams Company, which manufactures paint pigment, was of particular interest. The strike began over the company's refusal to grant any form of union security and lasted 120 days. During the course of this strike the Central Labor Council in cooperation with the Paint Makers Union sent one of its assistant secretaries and a member from the struck plant to picket the main branch of the company in East St. Louis, Illinois. Their efforts not only helped the Paint Makers win the strike, but also laid the groundwork for a successful organizing drive in East St. Louis by the Painters Union, which now has bargaining rights at the plant.

Two hospital strikes took place in the East Bay this year: the Office Employees International Union No. 29 against Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, and the Hospital and Institutional Workers No. 250 against the Associated Hospitals. Both were settled to the satisfaction of the involved unions with the aid of the Central Labor Council.

I am taking this opportunity to thank the members and officers of our affiliated unions, State Federation of Labor and State CIO Industrial Union Council for their cooperation and assistance in helping us to carry on the very successful program of the labor movement in Alameda County.

Fraternally submitted,
ROBERT S. ASH.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT PAUL L. JONES FOR DISTRICT No. 10B (Alameda County)

Oakland, November 18, 1958.
To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—
Greetings:

I had hopes of using one word to cover my report for the last year, that word being: progress.

The great advocate of the "right to work" in the state, William Knowland, having won his point of the right to work

for Dad, will now be about to centralize his activities in the "one newspaper" city of Oakland. The word progress would be out of line for this county; the Senator from Formosa will be raising hell in Alameda County.

Next year, I hope I'll be able to use the one word in my report.

Fraternally submitted,
PAUL L. JONES.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT HOWARD REED FOR DISTRICT No. 11 (Contra Costa County)

Martinez, November 7, 1958.
To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—
Greetings:

During the past year, the labor movement in Contra Costa County experienced the same painful difficulties stemming

from the nationwide recession as elsewhere in the state, but in the last few months we seem to have emerged from it successfully.

Temporary Unemployment Compensation

California, along with other states,

signed an agreement on June 20, 1958, with the U. S. Secretary of Labor to serve as agent of the federal government in paying temporary unemployment compensation to unemployed members of the covered labor forces who had exhausted their regular unemployment insurance benefits. By the end of July, when our people should have been employed, California's Unemployment Department had taken nearly 50,000 new federal claims under the temporary unemployment compensation. It was not until the latter part of August that jobs started opening up, and now the majority of union members are again employed, although the bulk of the gain was concentrated in the bay area's canneries during September and October. Construction payrolls began in September, bringing to an end an 18-months period during which employment lagged behind that of last year.

Employment Outlook

New industry coming into Contra Costa County each year, provides employment for thousands of semi-skilled workers, and with the influx of population, new shopping centers, schools and homes must necessarily be built. Several large tracts are now under construction in the Pinole Valley, with considerable home construction under way in the Brentwood and Oakley areas. The employment situation generally for Contra Costa County looks brighter now than it did several months ago.

With the expansion programs in the oil industry, building trades mechanics are again employed after months of idleness. Freeway construction along the tunnel strip is progressing. The approaches to Carquinez bridge are practically completed, with the dedication of the new bridge scheduled for November 25. All in all, the contemplated construction work now underway should keep up the steady employment for building trades craftsmen for some time to come, with little or no unemployment among skilled or semi-skilled workers.

The completed Ethyl corporation in Antioch area, has provided employment for hundreds of workers, some of whom had been laid off from the steel and fibre-board industries. Construction workers are now employed on the two new units for PG&E in Pittsburg and the Linde Union Carbide Company near Antioch. Columbia Steel is also adding an annealing plant, which is now under construction. In the western end of the county, two plants for the Standard Oil refinery are

under construction, which will take several years to complete.

Council Merger

On the merger of the Contra Costa Central Labor Council and the Contra Costa Industrial Union Council, committee meetings have been held, and although plans have been practically completed for the merger to take place in December, there is a further discussion to be held on per capita tax apportionments.

New Agreements

The Culinary crafts have negotiated agreements for another two years, with substantial benefits gained. The Retail Clerks have also completed negotiations for the various industries covered by their union. Sugar Refinery Workers negotiating with C & H Sugar Refinery, reached an agreement, effective July 1, 1958, for 6.8 per cent, or 14 cents per hour increase, whichever would be the highest, and retroactive to September 1, 1957. The agreement was extended from September 1, 1958, to February 1, 1959. Negotiations are now in progress for a tentative program, which will be voted upon by the union members in the near future, which will call for a 9 cents per hour increase, effective February 1, 1959, and retroactive to September 1, 1958. By February 1, 1959, health and welfare trust funds administration will be jointly administered by both the union and the employer.

Machinists' and Auto Mechanics' negotiations for agreements and health and welfare benefits, with a weekly guarantee, were also consummated with employer groups in Contra Costa County. Food distribution centers of the Safeway, Mutual and United Grocers in the Richmond area are providing employment for hundreds of clerks, warehousemen and truck drivers, and this steady employment will do much to add to the community's prosperity.

Blood Bank

The Contra Costa Labor Health and Welfare Council is now in the process of establishing a county blood bank for organizations belonging to the council. The council promotes improvements and expansion of the health and welfare services available to union members in the county, and represents members in compensation insurance settlements. Through participation in the health and welfare council's activities, our business representatives are in a better position to give advice to their

membership whenever it becomes necessary for them to call upon their representative to get them full benefits both in their health and welfare and state compensation insurance.

Election Results

The recent general election returns has proven again that California voters are not to be intimidated by threats from employers or employer associations. The defeat of Proposition 18 will do much to keep

friendly labor relations continued in the negotiation of agreements already established for many years, and add to the continued prosperity of the wage earner and industry in the state of California.

May I express my sincere thanks to those affording me the opportunity of serving the California State Federation of Labor as vice president in this district. We have worked with the rest of organized labor to the best of our ability.

Fraternally submitted,
HOWARD REED.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT LOWELL NELSON FOR DISTRICT No. 12 (Marin, Sonoma, Napa and Solano Counties)

Vallejo, October 30, 1958,

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—
Greetings:

In compiling this report from the 12th District, I do so with pride, because of the overall healthy conditions of the labor councils and their affiliates. In defining this condition, we would cite cooperation among unions, objectively, results favorable to membership on the collective bargaining level, successful collective fights against county "right to work" ordinances, and political education programs, which brought forth a more militant effort for candidates of our choice.

I have visited all labor councils and installed officers in several, also participating in installations and meetings with the regional AFL-CIO representative. I have been called upon and invited to numerous meetings to bring first-hand information concerning State Federation programs put into operation because of convention mandates.

"Right to Work" Ordinances

The formation of local committees to fight the phony "right to work" county ordinances, which later in the year developed into a fight against Proposition 18, was a major effort in many organizations. We were successful in the county fights, but it remains to be seen, November 4, 1958, if we are to be successful on the statewide level.

Collective Bargaining Gains

Several struggles with management developed in the district over organization and contract provisions, such as the lock-out of the Culinary Workers in Marin

County. This one lasted for 57 days and was finally settled with a contract satisfactory to the union membership. The California Employers Association was active in this lockout. Another strike-lockout situation occurred in the Santa Rosa area and lasted 30 days, and was settled with good gains to the Auto Machinists. The Retail Clerks and Teamsters combined in this same area to obtain contracts in the furniture and appliance field.

Generally, conditions in contract bargaining were good, and this can be attributed to the better than average effort in labor relations by the unions and councils in the 12th District.

New Merger Charters

New labor council charters were installed in Napa and Sonoma Counties, because of change of name and merger conditions. Sonoma County merged two central bodies under one charter, with headquarters in Santa Rosa. This has led to the formation of the County Policy Committee and eventual establishment of a full-time administrator. Solano County is yet to apply for a change of name charter, but this will be taken care of around the first of the year.

Improved Employment

Employment in the construction industry throughout the district is improving, after a big drop in volume last fall and winter and the early half of 1958. For example, it was the first of June this year before most unions could burn their out-of-work lists.

Community Activities

In the field of community effort, all

areas within the district recognized the need for participation and harmonious community work, such as helping to promote the United Crusade, boys clubs, Camp Fire activities, school scholarships, serving on city and county planning commissions, redevelopment agencies, housing authorities, etc. Several new buildings were constructed by organized labor for boys clubs and other community agencies.

Loss of Council Affiliates

In a year which saw changes in the membership structure of the labor family, I must remark about the continuing united effort in working together for the common goal of benefits to the membership. The councils and labor movement, in general, in this district deplore the necessity of losing the Teamsters as council affiliates. This is especially true in Marin and Sonoma counties, because of the close working relationship for many years. However, I note the same type of local coordination is continuing in the work and devotion for the welfare of the union membership. I sincerely hope that soon some way will be found to provide affiliation in all our councils for all local unions.

Health and Welfare Programs

Health and welfare programs, as pertaining to the relationship between doctors and patients, have received attention by all councils and their appointed committees. Meetings have been held with all county medical societies, and the result is a better understanding and uniformity of thought, while working on mutual problems will be helpful toward achieving satisfactory results for the membership covered by these programs.

Industrial and Community Expansion

Signs of new industrial development and community expansion is showing up in Solano County, with the completion of the Carquinez Bridge and sections of Highway 40 leading from the San Francisco Bay area. Another new highway bridge over the Sacramento River from Benicia to Martinez is to start in 1959, and with the purchase of large sites of land in the center of the county, it points to further employment in all fields.

Development of a vast new recreation area in Solano and Napa counties, because of the completion of Monticello Dam and the formation of large lakes of water, is opening up an entirely new area. Labor

in these two counties is participating in the plans for this development and also in the master plans for land use now taking place for orderly control of this expected growth.

Campaign Against "Right to Work"

In my opinion, the big story in this district is not the usual happenings of labor councils and local union administration, but the most important story is the educational program to alert the membership and workers, generally, of the danger to their economic welfare by the enactment of so-called "right to work" legislation. This program has been outstanding by all councils and unions in this district by the all-out registration campaign, the fight against enactment of county ordinances, and the manner in which the job has been tackled to carry the story against Proposition 18. The response of the rank and file membership to back up the council committees in all areas has been gratifying, and has provided the business representatives and council officers with confidence of achievement in the fight to preserve security in collective bargaining.

I visited and participated in meetings in all counties, as a Federation vice president, and I am proud of our efforts. As this is written before election, my confidence that this district will show solid results in our favor is unshaken.

State Merger

As we approach convention time and the merger of two great segments of labor in our state, I feel a great satisfaction in serving the State Federation and its affiliated unions and the membership. I think good work in their behalf has been carried on, but, of course, it is a continuing struggle and there is no room for a let-up in the program.

In serving as one of your merger committee members, I gained a further knowledge of the thoughts, desires and obstacles which must be blended, overcome or abandoned in order that we may present a united front and strive for increased benefits for the workers of our state. I am confident we can do this.

My thanks to the president and secretary and my colleagues on the executive council for their guidance and help, and to our loyal staff, my appreciation for courtesies over and beyond the requirements of position.

To the officers of councils and unions of the 12th District, I salute you for a

militant year of effort in behalf of your membership.

The services extended to our district by the regional office of the national office of the AFL-CIO is hereby noted for qual-

ity and results, and I extend thanks from us to them.

Fraternally submitted,

LOWELL NELSON.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT HARRY FINKS FOR DISTRICT No. 13

(Sacramento, Yolo, Colusa, Glenn, Butte, Sutter, Yuba, Nevada, Placer, El Dorado and Amador Counties)

Sacramento, November 7, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—
Greetings:

It is always a heart-warming experience to see a fully occupied labor movement accept tremendous new responsibilities and tasks and then fulfill them completely, without sacrificing or even neglecting its other duties and activities. That is what happened this year, although not for the first time, to be sure, to organized labor in District No. 13 when the advocates of the compulsory open shop forced upon the whole state labor movement a campaign to defeat Proposition 18.

District No. 13 was already geared for action when the "right to work" initiative proposal appeared on the scene right after the first of this year, for we had been in the thick of the "right to work" ordinance fight all during 1957. How we stepped up our activity, coordinated our programs, and moved on to victory at the November election, while at the same time carrying on our numerous and demanding other activities, this report will attempt to show.

"Right to Work"

The preliminary plans for the campaign against the "right to work" measure were drawn up and adopted by the Sacramento-Yolo County Labor Council at its meeting on January 21, 1958. The objective was to prevent the qualifying of the proposed initiative as a result of insufficient signatures on the petitions. A widespread educational program was instituted, urging our own people and the general public to refuse to sign the petitions. At the same time, we undertook to contact the council's membership for voluntary contributions of \$1.00 per member, these moneys to be collected by the council and forwarded to the State Federation of Labor for use in the statewide campaign against "right to work."

In March, the Labor Policy Committee was formed to combat the proposed initia-

tive on a city-wide basis. This committee brought together and coordinated the efforts of four area-wide labor organizations; the Sacramento-Yolo Central Labor and Building Trades Councils, the Railroad Shopcrafts Legislative Committee, and the Sacramento Allied Printing Trades Council, and it functioned, through regular and specially called meetings when necessary, right up to the election in November. Six areas of operation were covered by the following committees: Speakers, education of citizens, publicity, finance, registration, and get-out-the-vote.

The members of the speakers' bureau benefited greatly from a series of six coaching sessions under the direction of John Douglas Knox. These were attended by some two dozen officials and members from a cross-section of the trade unions in the Sacramento area.

The registration of union members was so vigorously carried out that County Clerk La Rue announced a record number of voters were eligible to vote in the primary election: 174,365 as compared with 148,407 for the 1956 primary. This, coupled with energetic get-out-the-vote activity, achieved the gratifying results of the June 3d election.

Desperate, expensive, last-minute efforts succeeded in qualifying the "right to work" initiative for the November ballot, and our campaign then became one to defeat Proposition 18. The Sacramento-Yolo Labor Policy Committee Opposing Proposition 18 announced the following program, which was carried out effectively during the ensuing months:

(1) The voters' registration committee was to start work immediately at the council and local union level.

(2) The speakers' committee was immediately to seek speakers' engagements, train speakers, and fill requests for speakers.

(3) The education committee was to arrange for the widest possible distribution of anti-"right to work" literature through-

out the greater Sacramento area. This included the showing of films.

(4) The publicity committee was to serve as central clearing authority for all publicity releases on Proposition 18.

(5) The finance committee was to see that each local union in the area was to have an actively operating finance committee.

(6) The get-out-the-vote committee was to start immediately to set up the necessary machinery to ensure a heavy vote by labor on November 4.

The keystone of the program was the registration of union voters, since the success of all other activity depended upon the voter-eligibility of our members. In midsummer, through the generosity and cooperation of the Sacramento-Yolo Building Trades Council and the members of the building trades unions, a hall in the Labor Center was set up and outfitted as a headquarters for the Labor Policy Committee's election preparations. It was staffed on a voluntary basis by members of the women's trade union auxiliaries and others, its prime function being to check on the registration of union members in the area and furnish this information to the registration committee.

Printed materials, pamphlets, posters, bumper strips, windshield stickers, and the like, ordered through the State Federation office, were given the widest possible distribution. The films, "Injustice on Trial" and "We the People," were shown at approximately two hundred meetings. State Federation speakers were available whenever requested. And at this time, I want to take the opportunity to thank, personally and on behalf of the Sacramento-Yolo Counties Central Labor Council, the officers and staff of the California State Federation of Labor for their fine cooperation during this long, hard-fought campaign.

The climax of our campaign was reached with the "Get Out the Vote" Rally, which was held in Memorial Auditorium on the evening of October 29. This rally was free and open to the public, and attracted a huge attendance. Secretary C. J. Haggerty of the California State Federation of Labor was the principal speaker, and city and county officials were guests. Through the generous cooperation of the American Guild of Variety Artists, the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, the Screen Actors Guild, and the American Federation of Musicians, a variety show was put on by such entertainers as Holly Winter, Penny Singleton,

Eddie Peabody and many others of similar calibre, and all this was possible to realize, thanks to the devotion of Musicians No. 12, which furnished a band, and Theatrical Employees No. B-66, Stage Hands No. 50, and Motion Picture Operators No. 252, all of whom supplied volunteer workers for the occasion.

Proposition 18 was decisively beaten at the November 4 election, while we succeeded in electing the overwhelming majority of the candidates we had endorsed for office. These included Albert S. Rodda, who had received the unanimous endorsement of the Sacramento-Yolo Central Labor Council in October for State Senate District 19, left vacant by the sudden death of Senator Earl Desmond.

While the city and county "right to work" ordinance drive was on during 1958, I attended numerous discussion meetings, as well as meetings of city councils and boards of supervisors, at the request of Secretary Haggerty, and presented our arguments against such ordinances. After the campaign against Proposition 18 began, most of my time was spent in setting up and organizing anti-"right to work" committees throughout northern California and coordinating their activities with the State Federation's campaign.

New Central Council Charter

The new AFL-CIO charter of the Sacramento-Yolo Counties Central Labor Council was presented at a special council meeting held on February 3 in Governor's Hall on the State Fair grounds, with more than two thousand in attendance. Many local unions and ladies' auxiliaries canceled their own regular meetings in order to be present on this historic occasion.

The new charter was presented by Dan Flanagan, regional director of the AFL-CIO. It was my honor to preside as master of ceremonies. President Thomas L. Pitts of the State Federation of Labor addressed the meeting, telling of the 60-odd year history of the council since the day in 1897 when it was first organized as the Sacramento Federated Trades Council.

The principal speaker was Secretary Haggerty, who emphasized California labor's newly launched fight against the proposed "right to work" initiative. Thus, this meeting also served as the kick-off of the local campaign against "right to work."

The list of distinguished guests was headed by Governor Goodwin Knight, and included Hugh Burns, speaker of the State Senate, Luther Lincoln, speaker of the State Assembly, State Senator Earl Des-

mond, Assemblymen Roy J. Nielsen and Thomas J. McBride, George Mock, international vice president of the Teamsters, and many other outstanding trade union figures.

New Council President

For the first time in the 61-year history of our labor council, we have a woman president. Sister Lilas Jones was unanimously elected president of the Sacramento-Yolo Counties Central Labor Council to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of Brother Albert A. Marty following the voluntary withdrawal of the Teamsters from the council. Sister Jones has been secretary-treasurer of the Waiters and Waitresses No. 561 for the past fifteen years and a delegate to the council since the early 1940's.

I wish to take this opportunity to compliment President Lilas Jones on her election and express my appreciation of the valuable contributions she has made to the council's work since she took office.

State Legislature

During the 1958 extraordinary session of the state legislature, I was associated with Secretary Haggerty in efforts to obtain enactment of the legislative program drawn up by the State Federation. Measures to alleviate the hardships imposed upon the California workers by the recession were the principal items in this program. Unfortunately, none of these items were included in the Governor's call for the special session, so no action on the program could be taken.

Community Activities

The Sacramento labor movement has always been outstanding for the role it plays, year in and year out, in the community. The J. L. R. Marsh Memorial addition to Mercy Hospital, the Rehabilitation Center for the Sacramento Society for Crippled Children and Adults, the Sacramento Blood Bank, the Children's Hard-of-Hearing Project—all attest to our unions' generous and sympathetic support, with both time and money, and the seriousness with which we accept and act upon our responsibilities as members of our community. That this spirit of service and sharing burns as warmly as ever despite the great increase in the population of the area and its expansion in all directions is proof of its genuineness.

This past summer the Sacramento-Yolo Central Labor Council was active in a new

field of community service. On the evening of August 21, the old-fashioned family baseball night at the ball park was revived by the citizens' and publicity committees of the Labor Policy Committee. This was part of a community plan to "keep baseball in Sacramento," and it threw the full support of organized labor behind organized baseball.

Family baseball night opened with a parade through the streets of Sacramento to the ball park. The ever-cooperative Musicians No. 12 provided a fifteen-piece band, which played old-fashioned favorites all during the parade. A brief program preceded the game, emceed by Jimmie Hicks, presently deputy director of the State Department of Employment and formerly editor of the labor council's official paper, the Sacramento Valley Union Labor Bulletin.

As chairman of the Children's Hard-of-Hearing committee, it is my pleasure to report that we successfully sponsored and carried through trips to the Shrine Circus, the California State Fair, and various other activities for these children. The labor movement also participated, as always, in the United Crusade, the Easter Seal, the City of Hope, and the Muscular Dystrophy campaigns, the March of Dimes, the Youth Conference, and others. As secretary of the labor council, I have also served as a member of the Boy Scouts Council.

California State Fair

At the request of Secretary Haggerty, I made arrangements for the celebration of Labor Day at the California State Fair. With Secretary Haggerty as official host, a special Labor Day luncheon brought together outstanding figures within and without the labor movement: Governor Goodwin Knight, Attorney General Edmund "Pat" Brown, Richard Walsh, president of the International Association of Theatrical Stage Employees, and labor officials from all over the state.

The special Labor Day Purse race highlighted the day's racing program, a trophy and a blanket being presented to the winner by Secretary Haggerty and Jack Goldberger, president of the San Francisco Labor Council and a member of the State Fair's board of directors. Evening brought a special fireworks display featuring the AFL-CIO banner and the Union Label.

Labor also sponsored a booth in the Industrial Building during the Fair.

Visit of French Labor Editors

In May, Dick Marriott, editor of the Sacramento Valley Union Labor Bulletin, and myself as secretary of the labor council, were co-hosts to a group of labor editors from France, who were in Sacramento for a one-day visit. This was part of a tour arranged by the U. S. State Department's Office of International Labor Affairs, and we hope that these visitors enjoyed their stay as much as we did.

Sacramento Ship Channel

Reports of slow but steady progress toward the realization of the Sacramento Deep Water Channel Project have been made by me for some years. It is now my pleasure to state that ground-breaking ceremonies were held this summer for the start of dredging a seven-mile stretch of this project, running from Washington Lake, ten miles from Sacramento, to a point east of Lisbon. The seven-mile stretch will cost \$7 million to build. Completion of the project, now scheduled for 1962, will enable deep sea ships to carry cargo ninety miles inland.

Advisory Council on Department of Employment

With Secretary Haggerty and Charles P. Scully, the Federation's chief counsel, as the other two labor members, I have at-

tended meetings of the Governor's Advisory Council on the Department of Employment throughout the past year. This labor-management advisory body, created by the 1955 legislature and appointed by the Governor, reports directly to him on employment, unemployment and disability insurance problems and developments.

Thanks

The list of those I would like to thank for their fine work is a long one—too long to be set forth here. But I must mention Dick Marriott, editor, and the Sacramento Valley Union Labor Bulletin for terrific assistance during the "right to work" campaign, and for its always excellent, week-in and week-out coverage of labor news. And I must mention two names—Dale Reed, international representative of the Machinists, and George Mock, international vice president of the Teamsters—with whom it has been a pleasure to work in close cooperation during trying times.

To Secretary Haggerty, President Pitts and the members of the Federation's executive council, who have helped the California labor movement, by experienced, dynamic leadership and devotion to trade union principles, to come safely through a dangerous period in its history—my congratulations for a job well done.

Fraternally submitted,

HARRY FINKS.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT ALBIN J. GRUHN FOR DISTRICT No. 14 (Humboldt, Del Norte, Mendocino and Lake Counties)

Eureka, November 14, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—
Greetings:

I am pleased to report that the labor movement of the 14th District gave a good accounting of itself in the recent November 4th general election. A high percentage of labor's recommendations were approved by the electorate, including the election of a new Congressman, Clem Miller, in the 1st Congressional District.

Defeat of Proposition 18

Notable among the election accomplishments was the 61.2 per cent vote against the so-called "right to work" Proposition 18 in Humboldt County. Add to this the fact that there were 848 more votes cast on Proposition 18 in Humboldt County than on any other Proposition or office

on the ballot. The local daily newspapers recommended a "Yes" vote on No. 18, but labor had the support of a cross-section group of businessmen, ranchers and professional men who formed the Humboldt Citizens Committee Against Proposition No. 18. Thanks to this committee and the untiring efforts of our local unions, councils, labor league and their respective memberships, we were able to overcome one of the most vicious campaigns ever mounted by the enemies of organized labor.

Recession Eased

In my last report I expressed the concern in this district over the economic recession which was sapping the vitality of this previously booming area. The situation actually worsened in the ensuing months when it spread from the lumber industry into wholesale unemployment in

the building trades. No noticeable improvement in the economy was evidenced until the late spring and early summer of this year, when a number of sizeable public building projects got underway along with increased volume of lumber product sales.

The only major local labor dispute during the past year involved Plumbers No. 471 and the Heating and Plumbing Contractors Association. This dispute, which began on July 1, was concluded last month with the Plumbers receiving a package increase of 25 cents per hour, making their new total package \$4.36 per hour.

New Council

The Central Labor Council of Humboldt and Del Norte Counties is the newly chartered central labor body of the AFL-CIO, replacing the former Central Labor Council of Humboldt County. There was no merger negotiations necessary in this area as no CIO council was in existence. The new charter, which covers the territorial jurisdiction of Humboldt and Del Norte Counties, was officially installed by AFL-CIO Regional Director Dan Flanagan. The Central Labor Council, which maintains an office at the Eureka Labor Temple in conjunction with the local Building Trades Council, is kept busy coordinating the functions of the local labor movement as well as assisting local unions in their disputes with local employers.

The Council has continued to sponsor the annual Labor Day picnic at Sequoia Park, which has become a tradition in this part of the state.

Unemployment in Building Trades

The Building and Construction Trades Council of Humboldt County and Vicinity and particularly the Carpenters, Laborers and Operating Engineers, experienced one of the most serious unemployment conditions for their membership in recent years during the winter of 1957 up to the early summer of this year. Highway projects, which got underway late this year, helped to aggravate this unemployment situation. The start of construction this summer on the new Humboldt County Court House and new Eureka City Hall, along with major projects at Humboldt State College, have improved the unemployment situation considerably. There has also been some improvement in the home building and commercial building fields.

Virtually all of the building trades unions' wage increases this year were re-

ported in my previous report, with the exception of the Hodcarriers, who received a 20 cents per hour increase. The Carpenters were finally successful in getting members of the local Home Builders Association to pay the 15 cents per hour increase retroactive to May 1, 1958. At one time the members of the Home Builders Association had filed a suit for declaratory relief on the status of their contractual relationship with the Carpenters. This suit was withdrawn at a later date when the Association signed the new memorandum of agreement with the Carpenters.

Redwood District Council

Local unions affiliated with the Redwood District Council of Lumber and Sawmill Workers have experienced a more favorable bargaining position as a result of the general improvement in lumber product sales. Negotiations have been concluded in some instances with local unions gaining in paid holidays and an employer-paid health and welfare plan. These agreements run until April 1, 1961, with a provision for reopening on wage rates on April 1, 1960. Other agreements that have been concluded provide for wage increases with a reopening on April 1, 1959. A few of the locals are still in negotiations. Some plant expansion is anticipated with the announcement by Georgia Pacific Corporation that it plans to build a large plywood plant at its Samoa operation.

Mendocino Central Labor Council

The Mendocino Central Labor Council, like many other small councils in sparsely populated areas, is having a continuing struggle to maintain its existence as an effective local coordinating body.

It is unfortunate that all of the various local unions having membership in such council areas do not participate fully in strengthening these councils to the maximum. A local council is as vital to labor's interests in a community as are local business and professional men's associations.

Political Action

The Humboldt County Labor League for Political Education is the only active labor league in this area. The successful results of its activities in connection with political education are pretty well covered in the opening remarks of this report.

Local Union Activities

Barbers' No. 431 has maintained its

\$1.75 rate for hair cuts and the five-day week with closing on Sundays and Mondays.

Bakers No. 195 voted to withdraw from the old International and is now affiliated with the American Bakery and Confectionery Workers International Union. The local negotiated a 7½ cents per hour increase, effective May 1, 1958, and an additional 5 cents per hour increase on October 1, 1958.

Bartenders No. 318 and Cooks and Waiters No. 220, through their Joint Executive Board-negotiated agreement, received an automatic increase of approximately 5 per cent on July 1, 1958. Their current agreement is not subject to reopening until July 1, 1959.

Butchers No. 445 are continuing to enjoy the fruits of their three-year agreement, which is not subject to reopening until next year. An increase of 9½ cents per hour this year and 7½ cents per hour next year was negotiated for the Egg Workers division. The new agreement also provides for three weeks' vacation with pay. Negotiations are still underway for certain classifications in the Fish Workers division.

Hospital and Institutional Workers No. 327 has voted to reopen its agreement with the General Hospital. Negotiations are expected to get underway next month.

Laundry Workers

Laundry Workers No. 156 has just concluded negotiations with the local laundry employers. Spokesmen for the majority of the union laundries proposed wage increases ranging from 10 to 7 cents per hour, effective October 1, 1958, with an additional 3 cents on October 1, 1959, and October 1, 1960. The union's final proposal was a flat 10 cents per hour across the board increase on October 1, 1958, with a 5 cents increase on October 1, 1959, and 5 cents on October 1, 1960. The final outcome of the negotiations was a mutual agreement between the union and the employers to submit the area of difference between the employers' proposal and the union's proposal to an impartial arbiter for a decision. All other provisions of the proposed agreement have been approved. The New Troy Laundry has indicated their approval of the union's 10-5-5 proposal.

It should also be noted that the local Laundry Workers' Union voted to withdraw from the old International and to affiliate with the newly chartered AFL-CIO Laundry and Dry Cleaners Interna-

tional Union. International Vice President Russ Crowell has given considerable assistance to this local.

Firefighters No. 652 and Municipal Employees No. 54 were not successful in increasing their wage rates in the City of Eureka, due to local economic situations which had an adverse effect on city revenues.

Machinists No. 540, after prolonged negotiations and a threat of possible strike action, was finally able to conclude a new agreement with the Humboldt Motor Car Dealers Association providing for a 6 cents per hour increase.

Motion Picture Machine Operators No. 430 are continuing to operate under the terms of an agreement negotiated after their long strike action two years ago.

Musicians No. 333 has purchased a building on 723 Third Street, Eureka, which will be their new headquarters. The local also voted to increase its rates to \$5.00 per hour. This is the first increase in rates for Local No. 333 members since 1950.

Printing Pressmen No. 279 and Typographical Workers No. 207 were successful in negotiating a two years agreement with a wage increase of 10 cents each year. The negotiations were prolonged this year due to the competitive problems caused by several non-union shops in this area.

Retail Clerks

Retail Clerks No. 541 has had a rather rough year. After the union's extensive patronage picketing of the local Montgomery Ward store during the nationwide effort to get a satisfactory agreement with the Ward Company, the employees of the local store voted to decertify the union as the bargaining agent. The union also lost its bargaining rights at the local Woolworth Store after two NLRB elections. The vote in the first election was 8 to 7 against the union. The union protested the election because of certain actions of management personnel and a new election was ordered. The second election was also lost by a vote of 8 to 7, indicating that management had done an effective job in opposing the union. On the brighter side of the ledger, however, was the renewal of the union's agreement with the Spiegel Outlet Store with a wage increase. The major part of the local's membership is in the Food and Liquor Store division, which is enjoying one of the best agreements in the country with an automatic increase of \$2.00 per week, effective September 30 of this year.

Teachers No. 1203 is in a dormant status at the present time due to the loss of membership. Many of their most active members have left this community to teach in other parts of the state.

Apprenticeship Training

The local unions and councils are continuing to assist the representatives of the Division of Apprenticeship Standards in their untiring efforts to produce the highest class of journeymen for the future work force of the community and nation.

Labor Day Celebrations

Since my last report the Central Labor Council of Humboldt County has sponsored two very successful Labor Day picnics at Sequoia Park in Eureka. On Labor Day 1957, our guest speaker was John F. Henning, research director of the Federation, who gave a very interesting and informative talk on so-called "right to work" legislation. AFL-CIO organizer John Owens was the guest speaker at this year's celebration. He stressed labor's responsibilities in community affairs and the necessity of defeating the so-called "right to work" Proposition 18. Approximately \$1000 was netted at this year's celebration, which was turned over to the campaign fund against Proposition 18.

Conclusion

In closing this report, I realize that it is my final report to a California State Federation of Labor convention. During the past eighteen years it has been an

honor and a pleasure to serve as a vice president of this great state labor body which has done so much to elevate the status of the working men and women of California.

Looking back over this period of time, I am thankful for such leaders as the late Secretary-Treasurer Ed Vandeleur, former president and now Congressman John F. Shelley, and our present officers, President Tom Pitts and Secretary-Treasurer C. J. "Neil" Haggerty; for legal counsel such as the late Charles Janigian and our present counsel Charles Scully, and for our Research Director John F. Henning.

It has also been an honor for me to serve as a member of the Federation's Merger Committee. The members of this committee have worked patiently for many months in an effort to bring about an equitable basis for merger of the former AFL and CIO state labor bodies. The end product may not be perfect, but I am confident that it is a foundation upon which we can build an even greater Federation of Labor in the future, one which will continue to give leadership and render service to the working men and women second to no other state labor body in the nation.

Finally, I wish to express once again my deep appreciation to the officers and members of the local unions and councils of the 14th District for their assistance during these many years. I also wish to thank my fellow vice presidents and the staff of the Federation for their splendid cooperation.

Fraternally submitted,
ALBIN J. GRUHN.

REPORT OF VICE PRESIDENT ROBERT GIESICK FOR DISTRICT No. 15

(Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, Plumas, Shasta, Tehama,
Trinity and Sierra Counties)

Redding, November 10, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—
Greetings:

In the past fourteen months the affiliated unions of the California State Federation of Labor in the 15th District have made reasonable gains in collective bargaining and in organizing the unorganized, in face of the attempt of the California Association of Employers and other labor-haters to destroy the labor movement by initiating "right to work" legislation on a county basis to stop the organizing drive of the Five County Central Labor Council.

Unemployment Serious

Unemployment has been a major factor in the economic welfare of the district. Unemployment became a major problem due to the construction of projects such as the Trinity River Project at Lewiston. This project has been advertised all over the nation. Workers traveled hundreds of miles to find that there were no jobs available. Members of all trades are urged to contact the union of their craft before seeking employment on the Trinity River Project.

New Council Charter

The Five County Central Labor Council

has received and installed a new charter by the AFL-CIO.

The Central Labor Council, with the co-operation of the Northern California District Council of Lumber and Sawmill Workers and the Northeastern California Building and Construction Trades Council, has been very active in community and civic affairs.

"Right to Work" Ordinances

The Five County Council has had the assistance of the California State Federation of Labor legal staff in the litigation of the Tehama and Trinity County "right to work" ordinances. I have been advised that the boards of supervisors in both counties have stated that they would repeal the ordinances if the people would defeat Proposition 18. Proposition 18 was defeated in both counties. With the proper

approach, I am sure that the boards will repeal the ordinances.

Proposition 18

The Five County Committee on Political Education was very active in defeating Proposition 18, and used all of their political strength to elect favorable candidates to the state legislature, and to assist in the election of State Senator Bizz Johnson to Congress in the 2nd Congressional District.

In closing, I wish to thank the affiliated unions and councils in the 15th District for the privilege of representing them as a member of the executive council of the California State Federation of Labor. I also want to express my thanks for the friendly cooperation received from members of the executive council.

Fraternally submitted,

ROBERT GIESICK.

REPORT OF SECRETARY-TREASURER C. J. HAGGERTY

San Francisco, November 15, 1958.

To the Fifty-sixth Convention of the
California State Federation of Labor—

Greetings:

When the fifty-sixth and final convention of the California State Federation of Labor convenes here in San Francisco on December 8, 1958, it will lack but one month of being fifty-eight years ago that a handful of trade unionists met in the same city, on January 7, 1901, to found this federation, the first statewide labor organization in California. Some nine thousand workingmen and women were represented by the one hundred and sixty-three delegates, who came from sixty-one local unions and five central labor councils.

In founding a state federation of labor in this state at that time, they were accepting the challenge of problems, conditions of employment, attitudes toward union labor, and a lack of unity and singleness of purpose in the labor movement itself, that would daunt, even today, a large and experienced organization.

The history of our Federation since 1901 is a history of growth and accomplishment, and of sometimes slow, sometimes rapid, but always steady advance in the improvement of the wages, hours and conditions, and the security of the California workers. It is also the history of a labor movement which has firmly established itself throughout the state as a potent force for community welfare, pro-

gressive legislation, and a source of indispensable leadership during periods of crisis and emergency. Through two world wars our Federation functioned effectively and grew in strength and value to our membership; we weathered the great depression of the 'thirties and the numerous lesser recessions before and since. Always we moved forward.

Now our California State Federation of Labor is on the threshold of merger with its CIO counterpart, the California Industrial Union Council. In this coming together, only the names of our separate organizations will cease to exist. The new federation, the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, will be an amalgam of two organizations, each rich in tradition and experience, both faithful to the same principles and steadfastly devoted to the same aims.

So, as we meet in this last convention of the California State Federation of Labor, we look back over the nearly sixty years of the old Federation with affection and pride, and forward to the new federation with confident expectation of even greater accomplishment on behalf of the organized workers of California.

Salve atque vale, California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, and California State Federation of Labor!

State AFL-CIO Merger

On September 9, 1958, two and a half

years of negotiations by the joint state AFL-CIO merger committee reached a successful conclusion with the approval by the general board of the California Industrial Union Council of the basic merger documents, which had been developed and agreed to by the joint committee and approved on August 24, 1958, by the executive council of the California State Federation of Labor. Similar action was taken on these same dates on the basic documents merging the California Labor League for Political Education and the California CIO COPE.

Approval of these documents—the merger agreements, new constitutions, and convention rules and order of business for the respective merged organizations—by separate conventions of the California State Federation of Labor and the California Industrial Union Council, and by the CLLPE and California CIO COPE will establish the new state labor organization, the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, and the new state labor political organization, California Labor COPE.

Copies of these documents will be given to delegates to the State Federation and CLLPE conventions prior to their opening.

Convention City and Date

The cities of Honolulu, Santa Barbara and Santa Monica had placed their convention bids before the Federation's 1957 convention held in Oakland; Honolulu received 242,666 votes, Santa Monica 194,594, and Santa Barbara 112,424. Since none of the cities received the required constitutional majority vote, the issue was therefore to be decided by the Federation's executive council.

At its meeting in November, 1957, the executive council voted to postpone the selection of the 1958 convention city until the questions of merger and a merger convention were resolved. Subsequently, the city of San Francisco and the week of December 8-13, 1958, were agreed upon when the merger agreements were approved by the executive bodies of the State Federation of Labor and the California Industrial Union Council.

Merger Committee

Members of the Federation's merger committee which met jointly with the state CIO's merger committee during the long period of negotiations were the following: President Thomas L. Pitts, Secretary-Treasurer C. J. Haggerty, Vice Presidents Robert J. O'Hare, Thomas A. Small, Jack Goldberger, Lowell Nelson, Harry

Finks, Albin J. Gruhn and Pat Somerset, Vice President M. R. Callahan was added to the committee when it was redesignated to function with the CIUC counterpart in preparing for the initial conventions of the merged organizations.

AFL-CIO 1957 Convention

A copy of the call to the second convention of the National AFL-CIO, which was held December 5-12, 1957, in Atlantic City, was received by your secretary in October. In an accompanying letter, Secretary-Treasurer William F. Schnitzler explained that credentials had not been forwarded with the call because the California State Federation of Labor and the California Industrial Union Council had been unable to achieve a merger to date, and since, under the AFL-CIO constitution, our Federation was not a chartered body of the AFL-CIO, it was therefore ineligible for representation at the convention.

The matter was reported by your secretary to the executive council at its meeting in November. Because of the seriousness of our merger problems at that time, the council directed President Pitts and your secretary to attend the AFL-CIO convention.

Acting under mandate of our Federation's 1957 convention, your secretary forwarded the following four resolutions to the AFL-CIO convention: (our numbers) No. 67—"Limit Importation of Foreign Fish and Fishing Products"; No. 74—"Issuance of Commemorative Stamp Honoring Professional Fire Fighters"; No. 83—"Time and One-Half for Substitutes"; No. 110—"Require Affiliation of Local Unions With State and Local Central Bodies." Subsequently, however, your secretary was informed by Secretary-Treasurer Schnitzler that since our federation was not eligible for representation at the convention, our resolutions could not be accepted.

The principal concern of President Pitts and your secretary at the AFL-CIO convention was the action taken in regard to the merger of state and local bodies. The resolution that was adopted was presented by the convention's Committee on State and Local Bodies. This was a strongly worded resolution, authorizing President Meany to revoke the charters of all state and local central bodies which had not effected merger by December 5, 1957, and to take such action as might be necessary either to effect the merger of central bodies not as yet merged, or to create

and charter new central bodies in lieu of those whose charters were revoked.

Before this resolution was adopted, President Meany explained the intent of the committee's report and the resolution. He made it clear that while it was necessary for the executive council and the president to have the authority bestowed by the resolution, and already existing in the constitution, the council was fully aware that compulsory merger would not be a satisfactory solution of the problem. The council's intention, therefore, was to work intensively with the representatives of the various bodies to effect merger. Primary emphasis was to be placed on the merging of state bodies, and members of the executive council, in teams of two, would lend every assistance to these efforts.

The wisdom and correctness of this policy has been proved during the past year. Certainly in our own case, it has led to success.

Executive Council Changes

Four vacancies occurred in the executive council during the past year, two through death of incumbents and two through resignation.

District No. 2: Jack T. Arnold, vice president of District No. 2 since 1946, passed away on February 8, 1958. At its meeting in May, the executive council elected Michael R. Callahan, secretary of the California State Culinary Alliance, to replace Brother Arnold.

District No. 6: Following the resignation of Paul Reeves, vice president of District No. 6 since 1946, H. D. Lackey, secretary of the Building Trades Council of Kern, Inyo and Mono counties, was elected by the executive council in May to fill the vacancy.

District No. 1: Thomas L. Goodbody, president of Butchers No. 229, San Diego, was elected vice president of District No. 1 at the August meeting of the executive council to replace Max J. Osslo, who had resigned after having held this post since 1947.

District No. 9(D): Death took Harry W. Metz, vice president of District No. 9 (D) since 1956, on July 17, 1958. The vacancy was filled by the executive council in August by the election of Newell J. Carman, business manager of Operating Engineers No. 3 in San Francisco.

In Memoriam

Since the Federation last met in con-

vention, two of its former officers have passed away, in addition to Vice Presidents Jack Arnold and Harry Metz.

On November 12, 1957, death came to Roe H. Baker, who was a vice president of District No. 9 from 1918 to 1924, and president of the Federation from 1924 to 1926.

Joseph D. McManus, who was a vice president of District No. 9 from 1933 to 1938, died on September 15, 1958.

Both these brothers served the organized labor movement in California loyally and well, and the many who knew them personally have been saddened by their passing.

Federation Committees

The following committees of members of the executive council were appointed by President Pitts and your secretary, and have functioned as necessary throughout the period since our 1957 convention:

Education Committee

Thomas A. Small, Chairman
Robert S. Ash
John T. Gardner
Albin J. Gruhn

Pension Committee

Lowell Nelson, Chairman
Thomas A. Small
Morris Weisberger
Thomas L. Pitts
C. J. Haggerty

Legislative Committee

Arthur F. Dougherty, Chairman
Harry Finks
Pat Somerset
Robert S. Ash
Lowell Nelson

Merger Committee

Thomas A. Small
Robert J. O'Hare
Jack Goldberger
Lowell Nelson
Harry Finks
Albin J. Gruhn
Pat Somerset
M. R. Callahan
Thomas L. Pitts
C. J. Haggerty

Appointments and Honors

Several appointments from the ranks of labor to state boards and agencies have been made by Governor Goodwin Knight

since the Federation last met in convention.

In November, 1957, the Governor named W. J. Bassett, secretary of the Los Angeles Central Labor Council, and Charles P. Scully, chief counsel of the State Federation, to serve on the new seven-member Insurance Commission Health and Welfare Advisory Council. This advisory group was established by the Federation-backed law enacted by the 1957 general session of the state legislature, which subjects to the supervision and investigation of the state insurance commissioner all health and welfare programs created by or on account of contracts between labor organizations and employers. The function of the advisors is to make recommendations to the insurance commissioner in regard to the supervision of health and welfare plans.

At the beginning of the year, Donald Henry, executive secretary of the California State Federation of Teachers, was asked by the state superintendent of public instruction to serve as one of the advisors on the newly created teachers' fair employment practices commission. The formation of this commission, consisting of three members of the State Department of Education, with seven organizational representatives as advisors, resulted from the enactment of another state law in 1957. This legislation, introduced at the request of the teachers' union, authorized the establishment of the commission to assist and advise local school districts in overcoming problems related to racial, religious, or other discrimination in connection with the employment of all certificated employees. When the legislature provides additional needed funds, the commission will become permanent.

In February, 1958, Ernest B. Webb, state director of industrial relations since 1955 and a member of Painters No. 256, Long Beach, was named to the State Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board by Governor Knight.

The same month, Harry Finks, secretary of the Sacramento-Yolo Labor Council and vice president of the Federation's District No. 13, was appointed by the Governor to serve on the State Personnel Board. This appointment was immediately attacked by the California State Employees Association, long branded by the AFL-CIO state employee organizations as a "company union," on the absurd grounds that no union labor representative should sit on this board. Nevertheless, the appointment of Brother Finks was unanimously confirmed by the state Senate.

This past summer two additional appointments to the Department of Industrial Relations were made by Governor Knight. Edward P. Park, who had served as state labor commissioner since 1953 and is a member of Operating Engineers No. 3, San Francisco, was named to succeed Ernest B. Webb as director of industrial relations. A short time later, Clyde Bell, past president of the California State Council of Plasterers and Cement Masons, was appointed to the post of labor commissioner.

Also in the past year, the Governor reappointed Frank A. Lawrence to the Industrial Accident Commission, and Mae Stone-man and John W. Quimby to the Industrial Welfare Commission.

In November, President Thomas L. Pitts was named to the State Board of Education to succeed former Vice President Max Osslo, who resigned earlier this year. President Pitts has also been a member of the board of directors of the California State Compensation Insurance Fund since 1952.

During the decade and a half that your secretary has served as executive officer of the Federation, he has been honored by numerous appointments. Keen as my personal appreciation of these appointments have been, it has never been possible for me to forget that these honors have been, in essence, a recognition of the California State Federation of Labor's great contributions to industrial and labor relations and to the progress of the organized workers in our state throughout the nearly sixty years since its founding at the turn of the century.

Now, in the closing days of the organization known for so long as the California State Federation of Labor, and on the eve of the establishment of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, your secretary takes pride in pointing to the confidence and esteem with which the Federation is regarded by listing here the appointments he presently holds as the representative of our State Federation of Labor:

Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security, U. S. Department of Labor

Farm Placement Committee, Bureau of Employment Security, U. S. Department of Labor

Regional Labor-Management Committee of Defense Manpower Administration Board of Regents, University of California

Governor's Advisory Council on the California Department of Employment

Advisory Committee on Rehabilitation of Industrially Injured, State Department of Education

Vice President, International Labor Press Association, AFL-CIO

Joint United States-Mexican Trade Union Committee

AFL-CIO member, Latin American Unit of International Confederation of Free Trade Unions

Board of Directors, National Housing Conference

National Council, National Planning Association Sponsor, 1958 United Negro College Fund, Inc.

Archdiocesan Committee for Catholic Charities

Board of Trustees, San Francisco Maritime Museum.

The Federation and your secretary were also honored in April of this year at the tenth anniversary of the Industrial Relations Center of Loyola University of Los Angeles, with the presentation of a labor-management award for leadership in industrial relations.

I

ADMINISTRATION

1957 Convention Resolutions

A large number of the resolutions adopted by the Federation's 1957 convention required further action by your secretary. In general, such action consisted of bringing the resolutions to the attention of those concerned or interested in the subject matter by enclosing copies of the resolutions with a covering letter. Acknowledgement was usually prompt and appreciative; on the occasions when significant correspondence resulted, it has been summarized in this report.

Several resolutions were referred by the convention to the incoming executive council for study and/or decision. Disposition of these resolutions is also reported here.

Labor Organizations

Resolutions Sent to All Affiliates

In a pamphlet entitled "Therefore Be It Resolved . . .," twenty-one resolutions were sent to all our affiliated unions and councils. Grouped by subject matter under six headings, these resolutions were as follows:

Organizing Assistance

No. 93—"Support Organization of CPS, Blue Cross and Insurance Company Employees."

No. 94—"Assist Office Employees' Organization."

No. 150—"Assist Electrical Workers in Organizing the Unorganized."

No. 163—"Commend Federation and Others for Assisting Teachers' Organizing Drive."

No. 164—"Fair Labor Practices in Public Schools."

Union-Made Goods

Union Services

No. 21—"Transact All Insurance Matters With Union Insurance Agents."

No. 56—"Continue Support of Campaign Against L. A. Times and Mirror-Daily News."

No. 65—"Patronize Retail Stores Displaying Union Label and Employing Union Clerks."

No. 156—"Support IBEW Label."

Political Action

No. 106—"Registration Committees for 1958 Election."

Civil Rights

No. 105—"Equal Rights in Housing."

No. 107—"Civil Rights Committees."

No. 143—"Reaffirm Endorsement of NAACP, Community Service Organization, Jewish Labor Committee, National Urban League, Histadrut and Italian-American Labor Council."

Education

No. 2—"Workers Education."

No. 3—"Public Education."

No. 4—"Reaffirm Endorsement of Coro Foundation."

No. 99—"Increase the Influence of the Local Labor Press."

No. 161—"Support U. C. Collection of Trade Union Materials."

Community Service Activities

No. 5—"Participate In and Support Community Chest and Other Federated Fund-Raising Campaigns."

No. 6—"Cooperate and Assist in Development of AID Membership Chapters."

No. 147—"Endorse and Support CARE Program."

Resolutions Sent to All Central Labor Councils

No. 13—"Increase Pay for Jury Duty."

No. 69—"Oppose Integration of Police and Fire Departments in All Cities, Municipalities and Political Subdivisions."

**Resolutions Sent to
AFL-CIO President Meany**

No. 14—"Oppose P G & E 'Partnership' Program at Trinity River Dam."

No. 44—"Prohibit States From Enacting Labor Laws More Restrictive Than Federal Laws."

No. 76—"Support Proposed Tuna Import Act of 1958."

No. 79—"Postal Pay Raise."

No. 85—"Remove Taft-Hartley Discrimination Against Guards."

No. 90—"Give Farm Labor Jobs to U. S. Citizens."

No. 111—"Campaign to Improve Economic Conditions."

No. 131—"Social Security and Welfare."

No. 133—"Increase Income Tax Exemption in Lower Income Brackets."

**Resolution Sent to AFL-CIO Civil
Rights Committee and Department**

No. 52—"Support AFL-CIO Policy on Civil Rights."

**Resolutions Sent to
AFL-CIO Convention**

No. 67—"Limit Importation of Foreign Fish and Fishing Products."

No. 74—"Issuance of Commemorative Stamp Honoring Professional Fire Fighters."

No. 83—"Time and One-Half for Substitutes."

No. 110—"Require Affiliation of Local Unions With State and Local Central Bodies."

Secretary-Treasurer Schnitzler subsequently informed your secretary that since our federation was not eligible for representation at the convention, our resolutions could not be accepted.

Federal Officials And Agencies

**Resolutions Sent to
President Eisenhower**

No. 33—"Allocate New Ship Contracts to West Coast Shipyards."

No. 136—"Investigate Radiation Hazards from Bomb Testing."

No. 141—"Reaffirm Previous Positions on Civil Rights."

No. 142—"Amend the McCarran-Walter Act."

**Resolutions Sent to California
Senators and Congressmen**

No. 9—"Political Rights."

No. 40—"Protection of Timber and Water Resources."

No. 44—"Prohibit States From Enacting Labor Laws More Restrictive Than Federal Laws."

No. 76—"Support Proposed Tuna Import Act of 1958."

No. 78—"Seniority by Law."

No. 80—"Personnel Management Relations."

No. 83—"Time and One-Half for Substitutes."

No. 95—"Sale of American Ships."

No. 96—"Rehabilitation of American Shipping."

No. 97—"Marine Hospitals."

No. 112—"Urging Early Adoption of AFL-CIO Housing Program."

No. 121—"Eliminate or Reduce 20 Per Cent Cabaret Tax."

No. 134—"Condemn Administration and State Department's Anti-Democratic Foreign Policy."

No. 136—"Investigate Radiation Hazards from Bomb Testing."

No. 141—"Reaffirm Previous Positions on Civil Rights."

No. 142—"Amend the McCarran-Walter Act."

No. 155—"Communication Labor Board."

**Resolution Sent to
Congressional Delegations
From Other States**

No. 33—"Allocate New Ship Contracts to West Coast Shipyards."

As mandated by adoption of this resolution, copies were sent to every congressman and senator representing the eleven western states; namely, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming.

**Resolutions Sent to Various
Officials and Agencies**

No. 33—"Allocate New Ship Contracts to West Coast Shipyards."

In addition to sending copies to President Eisenhower and the congressional

delegations from the states listed above, we also sent copies of this resolution to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the U. S. Bureau of Ships.

No. 40—"Protection of Timber and Water Resources."

Copies were sent, in addition to the California congressmen and senators, to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior.

No. 64—"End NLRB Delay in Establishing Union Representation."

A copy was sent to the chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

No. 67—"Limit Importation of Foreign Fish and Fishing Products."

Copies were sent to the Fish and Wild Life Service, Branch of Commercial Fishing, of the U. S. Department of the Interior, and to the State Department.

No. 76—"Support Proposed Tuna Import Act of 1958."

In addition to other mailings reported above, copies were sent to the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and to Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell.

No. 112—"Urging Early Adoption of AFL-CIO Housing Program."

A copy was sent to Housing Administrator Cole.

No. 115—"More Liberal Construction of Disability Insurance Provision in Social Security Act."

A copy was sent to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

State Officials And Agencies

Resolutions Sent to Governor Knight

No. 31—"Legislation to Remedy Subsidence in Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor Area."

No. 41—"Compulsory Public Liability Insurance."

No. 46—"Establish at Least \$1.25 Minimum Wage in California."

No. 72—"Appointment of Labor-Affiliated Fire Fighters to State Fire Protection Program."

No. 151—"Strengthen Juvenile Court in Meeting Juvenile Delinquency."

In the Governor's absence, the receipt

of these resolutions was acknowledged by the Governor's departmental secretary, Theodore H. Jenner, who informed us that he had transmitted copies of your secretary's letter to the Director of Finance, Director of Motor Vehicles, Insurance Commissioner, Director of Industrial Relations, Chairman of the Industrial Accident Commission, State Fire Marshal, Director of the Disaster Office, and Director of the Youth Authority, in order that they might be aware of the resolution whose subject matter was of concern to their respective departments. In connection with **Resolution No. 151** he referred to Governor Knight's appointment on September 27, 1957, of a Special Study Commission on Juvenile Justice to deal with the specific problem referred to in our resolution.

Resolutions Sent to Various Officials and Agencies

No. 34—"Support Enforcement of State Industrial Safety Rules on All Floating Vessels."

Copies were sent to the State Division of Industrial Safety.

No. 41—"Compulsory Public Liability Insurance."

Copies were sent to Attorney General Brown and to Jesse M. Unruh, chairman of the Assembly Committee on Finance and Insurance.

No. 46—"Establish At Least \$1.25 Minimum Wage in California."

Copies were sent to members of the State Industrial Welfare Commission.

No. 129—"Rephrasing of State Examination Qualifications."

Copies were sent to the president and secretary of the State Personnel Board.

No. 152—"Scope of Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company Franchise."

Copies were sent to the president and secretary of the State Public Utilities Commission.

Other Mailings

No. 4—"Reaffirm Endorsement of Coro Foundation."

A number of copies were sent to the Coro Foundation.

No. 17—"Labor Leadership Training Courses."

Copies were sent to the Extension Division of the University of California in Berkeley and in Los Angeles.

No. 77—"Support Use of Union Label

by Technical Engineers in Los Angeles."

Copies were sent to the Mayor of Los Angeles and to members of the Los Angeles Board of Public Works.

No. 161—"Support U. C. Collection of Trade Union Materials."

A copy was sent to President Sproul of the University of California.

Resolutions Referred To Executive Council

The following resolutions were referred by the 1957 convention to the executive council, which acted upon them at its November 1957 meeting:

No. 1—"Labor-Sponsored T-V and Radio Programs."

The council voted to postpone action until such time as funds were available to to sponsor such program on a permanent and representative basis.

No. 170—"Publicity Campaign for Labor."

The council voted to postpone action until such time as funds were available to sponsor such programs on a permanent and representative basis.

No. 7—"Use American Motion Picture Craftsmen on Films Made Outside U. S. and Canada."

Following discussion, the council voted to file the subject matter due to the fact that the sponsor had not supplied sufficient data on the various technical points to be considered in forming such a program.

No. 13—"Palm Springs Campaign."

The council voted to file the subject matter as the question of placing various establishments in Palm Springs on its "We Don't Patronize" list was still pending before the executive council of the national AFL-CIO, and in the meantime, the Federation was without authority to grant the request contained in the resolution.

No. 37—"Federation Public Relations Program for County Fairs."

The council voted to file the subject matter since funds were not presently available for the financing of such a program.

No. 68—"Support Los Angeles Office Employees in Injunction Case."

Following discussion, the council voted to file the subject matter of the resolution.

No. 119—"Aid for Workers Displaced by Automation."

The council voted that the solution of this problem would require both legislative and collective bargaining action, and referred the prepared legislation to your secretary for appropriate action at the proper time.

No. 125—"Require Licensing of Equipment Rental Firms."

Since legislation was required by this resolution, the council referred the matter to your secretary for appropriate action at the proper time.

No. 126—"Right of Political Subdivision Employees to Join Union."

Legislation being required by this resolution, the matter was referred to your secretary for appropriate action at the proper time.

Educational Activities

Although the tremendous demands made upon the Federation by the fight to defeat Proposition 18, as well as the campaigns to elect the candidates endorsed by the CLLPE, forced the omission this year of the Federation's annual labor education institute, the remainder of our long-established educational program was successfully carried through, and we participated as usual in numerous other educational activities.

Labor Press Conferences

The Federation's eighth annual labor press conference, sponsored jointly by the Federation and the University of California's Institute of Industrial Relations, was held in San Diego on November 17-18, 1957, and was attended by nearly one hundred editors and labor officials responsible for labor publications.

When your secretary announced the conference, the "right to work" issue was still in its ordinance stage, although no one doubted that the move to place it on the ballot as an initiative measure was imminent. Your secretary, in his announcement, therefore placed special emphasis on the indispensable role of the labor press in combatting this issue, pointing out that the task of selling labor's position on "right to work" would fall in a particular way on California labor publications, and that, because the work of labor education on this issue would have to be developed through every possible vehicle, the labor press was a ready-made instrument of information for the membership. In the campaign that has been waged for the past many months against Proposition 18, your secretary's confi-

dence in the labor press has been amply justified.

The entire afternoon of the first day of the conference was devoted to the "right to work" issue. E. M. Weston, president of the Washington State Labor Council, AFL-CIO, was the key speaker, reviewing techniques and procedures used by the Washington labor movement in defeating a "right to work" initiative on the 1956 ballot by better than two to one. (Despite their overwhelming defeat in 1956, however, the Washington "right to work" forces subsequently succeeded in placing the same initiative on this year's ballot, and the labor movement in that state was forced to combat this move for the second time in two years. The new "right to work" initiative was again decisively defeated on November 4.)

Gordon H. Cole, editor of *The Machinist* and president of the International Labor Press Association, addressed the banquet session of the conference on the subject of labor corruption, charging that it has been hysterically and shamefully exploited beyond all truthful proportions. The key points in his analysis were as follows:

(1) During the past five years, three Congressional committees—the Hoffman, Douglas-Ives and McClellan—have probed labor practices in virtually every state in the union, and have cited just 32 officials for misconduct.

(2) The AFL-CIO Ethical Practices Committee has named an additional eight officials.

(3) There are 16,000 officials on the payroll of national and international unions.

(4) There are 430,000 officials holding office in unions and councils across the country.

(5) Anti-labor agitators are talking about only nine-thousandths of one percent of the labor leadership of the country when they refer to headlines of officials who have betrayed the movement.

Inflation was the subject discussed by Dr. Melvin Rothbaum, associate professor of economics at the University of California at Los Angeles, and Mildred Brady, nationally known consumer education authority.

Robert Rutland, professor of journalism, and Currin Shields, professor of political science, both of UCLA, completed the list of speakers. Rutland headed discussions of newspaper makeup techniques.

Shields surveyed the motives and plans of America's anti-labor movement.

The Federation's ninth annual labor editors' conference was scheduled for Saturday and Sunday, November 22 and 23, in Monterey. Principal speakers and their subjects:

"The 1958 Election—Its Significance for Labor"—Dr. Irving Bernstein, Institute of Industrial Relations, UCLA.

"A Pollster Looks at the Election"—Hal Dunleavy, San Francisco.

"Labor and the State Legislature: The Prospect"—Thomas L. Pitts, president, California State Federation of Labor.

"What the Russians Are Told"—Dr. Peter Odegard, Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley.

"Retractions in the Press"—Albert G. Pickerill, Department of Journalism, University of California, Berkeley.

"Freedom of Speech and the Press"—Dr. Currin V. Shields, Department of Political Science, UCLA.

"Labor Press Advertising Ethics": panel discussion—R. L. Burgess, editor, *East Bay Labor Journal*, Oakland, and Lloyd Smith, advertising representative, *Olympic Press*, Oakland.

International Labor Press Association Awards

California labor papers were unusually successful in the Journalistic Awards Contest of the International Labor Press Association. Awards were made at the ILPH's convention held in Atlantic City early in December, 1957.

Three California papers were among nine local council publications winning prizes in the several categories. The *Vallejo-Napa Labor Journal*, a California Labor News Service publication, was the only local council paper in the country to receive a top award plaque, the others being scroll facsimiles. The *Vallejo-Napa* paper was judged tops in general editorial excellence, having the best balance of local, national and international news, being "tightly" written and with good makeup within the confines of a tabloid format.

The *Union Gazette* of San Mateo County won an award of merit for the best community project, as did also the *Sacramento Valley Union Labor Bulletin*.

The Southern California Teamster won in its classification for the best feature article, and the *Engineers News Record* took an award in the best single editorial

category, among local union papers.

More than five hundred entries were submitted in the contest, the largest number ever entered.

Your secretary was also honored at this convention by being re-elected vice president of the ILPA.

Labor Press Advertising Ethics

The ILPA was founded by Samuel Gompers in 1911 for the improvement of labor press standards and the development of ethical practices in labor journalism.

In this connection, your secretary wishes to refer to the statement of policy, "Labor Press Advertising Ethics," which was adopted by the Federation's 1957 convention and may be found in the proceedings of that convention, and to the following communication from President George Meany of the AFL-CIO, dated May 27, 1958, and addressed to the officers of all state and city central bodies:

Rule 24 of the Rules Governing State and Local Central Bodies provides that no central body "shall authorize or permit the solicitation of any advertising in its name or for publication in any periodical, program or other publication issued or endorsed by it which will be in violation of such ethical standards or requirements as may be determined by the President by regulation or otherwise."

It has recently come to my attention that the trade union movement is suffering unfavorable and adverse publicity through the actions of advertising solicitors who are not adhering to the high ethical standards which the AFL-CIO has established.

Specifically, advertising solicitors have been accepting ads for union periodicals and publications from non-union and anti-union employers, as well as anonymous advertising from purported "friends of labor." Obviously, advertisements from non-union employers do not belong in a labor publication and it is just as clear that a legitimate "friend of labor" would want his signature on an advertisement he placed.

Both types of ads violate the ethical standards of the AFL-CIO. Therefore, in conformity with the intent of the Rules Governing State and Local Central Bodies and in accordance with the powers vested in me, I hereby order and direct:

That all periodicals, programs or

other publications issued by, or authorized by AFL-CIO state and local central bodies cease and refrain from:

1. Using advertisements of employers who are not 100% unionized by AFL-CIO unions; and

2. Using advertisements which are not signed.

This order is effective immediately.

Other Conferences

Labor education was the theme of the second annual conference of the San Jose State College Institute of Industrial Relations held on March 24, 1958. John F. Henning, the Federation's director of research and publicity, represented the Federation at this conference and was one of the dinner speakers.

The Federation was one of the sponsors of a two-day conference on unemployment and the consumer, held at Asilomar, June 13-15. Oregon Senator Wayne Morse and Stanley Ruttenberg, director of research for the AFL-CIO, were among the speakers, as was also your secretary.

Sponsors of this excellent conference included the University of California's Institute of Industrial Relations, the Associated Cooperatives, Consumers Cooperatives of Berkeley, American Labor Education Service, the state AFL and CIO, and state organizations of building tradesmen, culinary workers, carpenters, machinists, teachers, communications workers, and theatrical employees.

1958 Federation Scholarships

Two boys and a girl were winners of the three \$500 scholarships in the Federation's eighth annual high school scholarship contest: John L. Dolan, 17, Hillsdale High School, San Mateo; John F. Peterson, 16, St. Ignatius High School, San Francisco; and Barbara Woth, 17, Redlands Senior High School, Redlands.

The contest was open as usual to high school seniors. Announcements and student application forms were mailed in February to all high school principals in California and Hawaii, and a two-hour written examination was held on May 9 in the applicant's high schools, testing the students' knowledge of industrial relations history and practices in the United States. A total of 448 students participated in the competition. Winners were selected on the basis of their performance in the examination, with consideration also being given to their four-year high school academic record.

The committee of judges which selected

the winners was composed of three professional educators; Frederick A. Breier, Assistant Professor of Economics, University of San Francisco; Vaughn D. Seidel, Alameda County Superintendent of Schools, Oakland; and Arthur Carstens, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Los Angeles. Identity of the students participating in the contest was not known to the judges.

This fall, the scholarship checks having been deposited in their names at the colleges of their choice, the three winners enrolled, as follows: John Dolan at the University of California in Berkeley; John Peterson at the University of San Francisco; and Barbara Woth at Mills College in Oakland.

These students will receive their awards and the honors due them at the Federation's coming convention.

University of California Exhibit

Delegates to the Federation's 1957 convention will undoubtedly remember the very fine exhibit of photographs and documents recording the achievements of the California State Federation of Labor between 1901 and 1957 which was on display in the Oakland Auditorium during the convention week.

This same exhibit was subsequently displayed in the University of California Library in Berkeley, October 4-18, 1957.

Materials for the exhibit, which was developed by Francis Gates of the Labor Collection unit of the library, were provided by the University Library, the California State Federation of Labor, the California Historical Society, the Olympic Press, Bay Area newspapers, Paul Scharrenberg, former secretary-treasurer of the California State Federation of Labor, and other collectors of labor history materials.

Federation Pension Program

The Federation's 1957 convention adopted a policy statement authorizing the Federation's pension committee and officers to establish a pension plan for full-time union officials and other full-time employees of affiliated organizations. As will be remembered, this idea developed originally at a week-long pension plan conference sponsored by the Federation in April, 1956, and was given further impetus by the 1956 convention, which voted to study the feasibility of establishing such a program. During the following year the pension committee worked out the plan of action and recommendations

which was presented to and adopted by the 1957 convention.

At the November 1957 meeting of the executive council, the pension committee reported that it had completed the essentials of the basic program and that detailed plans were then in preparation for presentation to the unions. A full report, including detailed plans, was mailed the following month to all our affiliated unions and councils, setting forth (1) the need for a pension program, (2) a general description of the program contemplated, and (3) steps to be taken by interested affiliates to obtain further information leading to a decision in the matter.

Subsequently, a questionnaire was sent to the affiliates which, when completed by them, would indicate the extent of their interest in the pension program. By the middle of September of this year, 322 replies had been received, and as a result, a fairly accurate over-all estimate of total interest could be made. Responses to the questions fell roughly, though not equally, into the following categories: interested in a pension plan but would like a more modest and less costly plan than has been proposed; interested but not yet ready to finance a plan; interested and may take further action in the near future; finally, and this was the answer of a large number of unions, not interested because a plan for officials and employees was already in existence through their international unions or some other means.

The pension committee will meet shortly before the opening of our convention to discuss the program in the light of all information then available and prepare recommendations to be presented to the convention.

California Minimum Wage

Since April 1956, the Federation has made a determined effort to obtain an extension of coverage by Industrial Welfare Commission orders to include women and minors employed in agriculture. What transpired up to last summer to further or to delay the achievement of our aim was set forth in some detail in your secretary's report to our last convention. Events since then can, unfortunately, be reported briefly.

In April 1957, the commission had decided to send labor-management committees into the agricultural areas of the state to obtain the necessary wage-hour data. A few months later this was superseded

by another decision: to hold a series of meetings in agricultural areas with employee and employer representatives who have an interest in the problems of the agricultural workers and knowledge of their working conditions. The purpose of these meetings, which began early in 1958, has been to secure first-hand information on the conditions of employment of women and minors in agriculture in order to provide the commission with data on the need and feasibility of having an order covering these workers.

Having determined that the hearings should follow the crops northward from the southern part of the state, the commission began its survey in El Centro in March, 1958, reaching Fresno in October, and with a possible final hearing tentatively scheduled for Stockton in January 1959. In all, four hearings have been held this year: March 7-8 in El Centro (covering the Imperial Valley); June 13-14 in Bakersfield (covering the Kern County area); August 21-22 in San Jose (covering the counties of Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito and Alameda); October 2-3 in Fresno (covering essentially the cotton and grape crops in the surrounding counties). Testimony was heard from employers and representatives of employer groups, agricultural workers and their representatives, and from all interested persons and organizations who asked to appear.

At each hearing, specific information was sought on

- (1) Crops in which women and minors are employed and work performed.
- (2) Span of season and approximate peak for this employment.
- (3) Number of women and minors employed at peak of season — (a) migratory and local (b) percentage of total farm labor force.
- (4) Rates of pay, method of payment, and average hourly earnings of women and minors.
- (5) Method of determining piece rates.
- (6) Hours worked by women and minors.
- (7) Records kept of hours and earnings by employer and employee.
- (8) Housing facilities and costs.
- (9) Sanitary facilities.
- (10) Transportation facilities.

Prior to each hearing, your secretary publicized it in the press releases sent to the California labor press. In addition to alerting representatives of the National

Agricultural Workers Union and the National Packing House Workers of America, as well as the Federation's vice presidents and the central labor councils in the areas covered, he wrote to some thirty or forty interested organizations and persons outside of the labor movement, telling them that the presentation of their views at the scheduled hearing would be of tremendous assistance to the women and minors who work on our California farms without the minimum wage and maximum hours and health protection of the Industrial Welfare Commission. This latter group included the many Catholic churches in the areas involved and such other religious organizations as the Council of Churches of both northern and southern California and the Presbyterian Synod of southern California; the Community Service Organization of Los Angeles; the California Farm Research and Legislative Committee; the Jewish Labor Committee; the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; the Democratic State Central Committee and the Northern California Democratic Committee.

As of this writing, the Industrial Welfare Commission is unwilling to set even an approximate date on which we may expect a decision or recommendations on this matter, but if an unreasonable delay occurs, the Federation will once again prod the commission to take action.

Health and Welfare Disclosure Law

The 1957 Rees-Doyle health and welfare disclosure law, which was advocated and strongly supported by the Federation at the last session of the California legislature, provided for the appointment by the Governor of a seven-member health and welfare advisory council to the insurance commissioner. The advisory group was named on October 28, 1957, and included among its members Brother Wilbur J. Bassett, secretary of the Los Angeles central labor council, and Charles P. Scully, the Federation's chief counsel. Later, it became necessary to create a voluntary technical advisory committee to assist the advisory council and the commissioner in the development of forms and rules and regulations. Don Vial, the Federation's economist, was appointed to this committee.

A series of hearings was conducted early this year by the commissioner in both San Francisco and Los Angeles. The Federation found itself in vigorous opposition to the narrow scope of application

which was developing during the hearings. Our position was then clearly set forth in a letter, dated June 30, 1958, to Insurance Commissioner F. Britton McConnell, as follows:

On behalf of the California State Federation of Labor, I wish to communicate our strenuous opposition to the narrow scope of application contemplated in the Rules and Regulations which you are presently considering for promulgation in connection with the administration of the Rees-Doyle Health and Welfare Program Supervision Act, AB 1773.

As you know, our organization was one of the primary proponents of this measure in pressing for its enactment by the California Legislature. Throughout the period of legislative consideration, we worked diligently with other private groups having an interest in employee health and welfare programs to secure agreement on the type of legislation that could be supported before the legislature. We were satisfied that with the passage of AB 1773, our efforts had met with success. The Rees-Doyle bill was one of the most carefully considered pieces of legislation to come out of the 1957 General Session.

In view of this legislative background, we find it difficult to understand how it is possible to construe the measure so that its application is restricted to "negotiated health and welfare programs," with the further limitation that such programs shall be "funded" and shall have come "originally . . . into existence in writing and as the result of negotiations between a labor organization or organizations and an employer or employers." (Section 2900 of the proposed rules, read together with the Section 2909). This narrow interpretation, not only exempts negotiated programs that are not funded, as, for example, so-called "level of benefit" programs, and programs that are established unilaterally which later become negotiated, but also precludes the registration and examination of "every" and "any" employee health and welfare program, as required and provided for, respectively, by Sections 10642 and 10643 of the Act.

It is our understanding that, in the interpretation of a statute, if there is no general provision in the Act specifically limiting the scope of its provisions, the Act must be construed sec-

tion by section in light of the declared purpose of the Act.

The Rees-Doyle Health and Welfare Act contains no general, restrictive section, but, rather, contains provisions limiting the application of a particular section and giving the Insurance Commissioner certain discretionary authority. On the other hand, the declaration of policy in Section 10640 refers to "employee health, welfare and pension programs," without any of the above-mentioned restrictions contained in the proposed Rules and Regulations.

It is apparent that the narrow interpretation proposed in the Rules and Regulations stems from an attempt to construe Section 10640 as a general limiting provision for the entire Act, insofar as its subjects specified negotiated programs to "supervision and investigation" by the Insurance Commissioner. The only exemption provided here relates to such "negotiated" programs. Specifically, the Section says that where the "funds of insurance policies or both" of such negotiated programs are placed with a corporate trustee subject to the jurisdiction of other specified agencies, then "such corporate trustee and such funds and insurance policies or either so held in trust shall not be subject to the supervision of the State Insurance Commissioner." We note in Section 2923 (2) of the proposed Rules and Regulations that you correctly interpret this nevertheless to subject the "programs" of negotiated plans so placed to your supervision and investigation, and also that the exemption of corporate trustees, funds and policies so placed from "supervision" does not exempt them from "investigation."

We believe it is totally incorrect, however, on the basis of the application of Section 10641 to negotiated programs to infer thereby that all the other sections apply only to negotiated programs, when in fact all of the other sections refer to employee health and welfare programs generally, as in the declaration of policy.

We by no means wish to imply that the language is clear in every respect, and that there is no room for administrative interpretation. On the contrary, while we believe the scope of application to programs is clear and must be inferred from the separate sections, it is not always clear in regard to the authority being bestowed upon the Commissioner, as for example in

the use of such terms as "investigate," "examine," and "inspect." Yet where the Act is least clear, no attempt is made in the proposed Rules and Regulations to define the terms used.

It is understandable to us that you should follow your declared intention of moving cautiously at the outset of administration by covering only such ground as you are certain of application. It is difficult for us, however, to accept this position as long as no effort is being made on your part to seek legal interpretation of the Act where you do not believe its application is clear.

As you know, Assemblyman Rees sought and obtained such interpretation from the Office of Legislative Counsel, in an opinion that was filed with you, at the request of Mr. Rees, by our General Counsel, Charles P. Scully, at the hearing which you conducted in Los Angeles, May 20, 1958. This opinion not only upheld our position for a broader interpretation of the scope of the Act, but in fact pointed out that the only exemption apparently contemplated by the Legislature was that stated in Section 10640 and confined to negotiated programs.

On behalf of the California State Federation of Labor, I therefore respectfully urge that a broader interpretation of the Act's scope be written into the Rules and Regulations promulgated by your office.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. HAGGERTY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Our protest was ignored, however, by the commissioner. The rules and regulations relating to the registration of health and welfare programs, together with a registration form have now been promulgated. Not yet promulgated, although hearings have been scheduled for the purpose, are the rules and regulations and registration forms for the annual reporting of programs to the Department of Insurance and to the beneficiaries of the programs.

Racial and Religious Tolerance

The continuing acts of violence directed against churches and schools in the South, and the constant open threat these pose to civil liberties and civil rights prompted the executive council to place itself on record with the issuance in May of this year of a statement, calling upon federal authorities to take action, praising the

role of organized labor in the crisis through its implementation of the AFL-CIO civil rights program, and urging all union men and women to aid in this historic struggle to preserve our American traditions and ideals. The statement follows:

Racial and Religious Tolerance

The California State Federation of Labor strongly urges U.S. Attorney General William P. Rogers to take immediate and effective action by launching a full-scale FBI investigation into the bombings and lawlessness which are threatening civil liberties and the security of many people in the South.

The recent series of bombings and bombing attempts against religious institutions and schools clearly indicate a concerted course of criminal action in a number of states and points to the existence of a conspiracy which warrants immediate investigation by the FBI. We call upon the Southern members of Congress and other public officials to join with us in this request for an FBI investigation since this pattern of lawlessness and violence threatens both the safety of innocent men, women and children and the structure of law and order in our Southern communities.

The progress of recent years to achieve fair treatment and equal opportunity for all Americans has ground almost to a halt. Inaction in furthering and enforcing civil rights, guaranteed to every American by the Constitution, is the order of the day in the Executive Branch of our government, as it is in the halls of Congress.

Action on several fronts is needed at once to implement the AFL-CIO's goal of equal rights for all Americans.

Eight months after its passage, the Civil Rights Act of 1957 has yet to start producing results. The Congress has not yet confirmed the appointment of the staff director of the newly-created Civil Rights Commission, nor appropriated the funds needed for its operation. The Department of Justice has not yet processed a single case involving deprivation of the right to vote, even though many such cases have been called to its attention. Meanwhile, the 1958 registration and primary voting period is underway and millions of American citizens continue to be deprived of their precious right of franchise because of the color of their skin.

If the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is to fulfill any of the hopes which friends of civil rights entertained at the time of its enactment, both the Administration and the Congress must permit no further delay in carrying out their respective obligations under the law placed on the statute books as long ago as September 9, 1957.

Even if fully implemented, however, the 1957 law is not enough to make secure the civil rights of our citizens.

Further legislation in the field of civil rights, and its proper enforcement, is urgent. But in the final analysis, progress in this sensitive area of human relations depends most on the determined effort of the American people themselves.

Organized labor is leading the way, through the AFL-CIO civil rights program, in winning the acceptance of equal rights for all among workers, employers and the community at large. Union-negotiated nondiscrimination clauses in collective bargaining agreements have proved themselves a bulwark against discrimination in employment.

We call on union men and women, in their own conduct and in the conduct of their unions, to set the right example and to point the way for all Americans to the fulfillment of freedom and justice in the best tradition of American democracy.

As this is being written, word comes that AFL-CIO President George Meany is now serving on a newly organized committee, known as "Americans Against Bombs and Bigotry," which has been formed to mobilize public opinion against bombings of schools, synagogues and churches. Co-chairmen are Governor-Elect Edmund G. Brown and Charles F. Taft of Cincinnati.

Governor's Industrial Safety Conference

The eighth annual Governor's Industrial Safety Conference was held in San Francisco on February 6 and 7, 1958. Among the more than 1100 representatives of labor and management, as well as individuals and organizations concerned with on-the-job safety in California, were many officials of our affiliated unions who actively participated in the proceedings.

Progress made in the last eight years since the first conference was held was dramatically revealed by statistics on dis-

ability work injuries. Thus, in 1950, there were forty-two injuries per 1000 workers (itself a drop from the World War II peak of fifty-one per 1000); in 1953, this fell to 36; and in 1957, it dropped still lower to less than 33.

The key speaker for organized labor was P. L. Siemiller, general vice president of the International Association of Machinists. After describing labor action in promoting on-the-job safety, Brother Siemiller presented to the conference the gist of a recommendation adopted by the 1957 AFL-CIO convention, urging all affiliated unions to insist that contracts with management contain clauses establishing the employers' responsibility to provide a safe work place and safe and healthful working conditions; that in every plant a union safety committee be established; and that future contracts contain basic safety clauses providing for the use of American Standards Association safety standards as minimum acceptable safety conditions.

During the two days of the conference, two-session meetings were held by major industry groups on their particular safety problems. These meetings featured speeches, panel talks and open discussions, which have proved of a great value in achieving improvements in industrial safety conditions.

Apprentice Graduation

It was your secretary's pleasure to address two of the annual apprenticeship completion ceremonies which take place throughout the state, usually in May of each year.

Forty-nine apprentices from towns in Monterey and Santa Cruz counties, representing twenty-one trades, received their completion certificates and full journeyman status in Monterey on May 23, while 250 young men were presented with their California state trade certificates in Oakland on May 26 at the East Bay's eleventh annual ceremony.

Whenever, over the years, your secretary has been honored by an invitation to speak to these new young journeymen, he has felt pride not only in them for their accomplishment, but in the excellence of our California labor-management apprenticeship program, to the establishment and development of which our State Federation of Labor contributed so greatly. This year's ceremonies were no exceptions.

II ORGANIZATION

California Union Membership

Membership in California labor unions showed an increase of three per cent, from 1,689,500 to 1,736,700, between July, 1956, and July, 1957, according to figures compiled by the Division of Labor Statistics and Research of the State Department of Industrial Relations. This matched the three per cent rise in nonagricultural employment in the state in the same period. Membership statistics for the succeeding period, July, 1957, to July, 1958, will not be available until the end of the year. A closer examination of the 1956-1957 figures, however, are still of interest.

In the Los Angeles - Long Beach metropolitan area, union membership increased one per cent to a total of 763,500 members, while nonagricultural employment rose three per cent in the area.

Unions in the San Francisco - Oakland metropolitan area had 479,500 members in July, 1957—two per cent more than in the preceding July. During the same period, nonagricultural employment also increased two per cent.

In the San Diego metropolitan area there was an eight per cent rise in union membership to 83,000 members, identical with the eight per cent increase in nonagricultural employment.

Federation Membership

New affiliations of local unions and councils have kept pace with the general increase in union membership in California. In common with state federations of labor and central labor councils throughout the nation, however, the Federation this year suffered the loss of affiliation of all Teamster local unions and councils, as well as those of the Bakery and Confectionery Workers and the Laundry Workers, all three of these internationals having been expelled from the national AFL-CIO at its December, 1955, convention.

AFL-CIO directives, issued to state and local central bodies on December 20, 1957, ordered the expulsion of these union locals. Before disaffiliation action was taken by the Federation's executive council in compliance with these directives, Brother Joseph A. Diviny, vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, appeared before the council at its May meeting, and stated that the three joint Teamster councils in California, not

wishing to embarrass the Federation, had voted to withdraw all Teamster affiliates from the Federation.

After expressing the Teamsters' sincere hope to reaffiliate with the Federation as soon as possible, Brother Diviny presented the Federation with a check for \$20,000 to be placed in the Defense Fund established to defeat the "right to work" initiative.

Your secretary expressed the Federation's regrets in regard to the Teamster withdrawal, and declared that the Federation also looked forward to the early re-affiliation of the Teamster locals and councils. Adoption of the following policy statement was unanimously voted by the executive council:

The executive council accepts with regret and reluctance the voluntary withdrawal of the Teamsters from the California State Federation of Labor.

For more than half a century they have been a great and stabilizing force within our movement. Indeed, it was largely the vision and dedication of pioneer Teamsters which led to the formation of the State Federation in 1901.

We shall never forget the heroic assistance extended to our affiliates during the past 57 years. Nor should the people of California forget the enormous contribution for good which they made to the economic and industrial progress of the state.

It is characteristic that they should pledge continued aid and cooperation in the very hour of withdrawal. It is also characteristic that their pledge should embody something more than mere oratory or rhetoric. As a departing gesture of brotherhood, they have today donated \$20,000 to the State Federation of Labor Defense Fund, a fund established to defeat the millionaire-financed "right to work" campaign now being fostered by the sworn enemies of the working people.

We particularly appreciate that throughout the state, the Teamsters have created coordinating committees to work in harmony with our affiliated unions and councils.

We look to the day when we shall again embrace the Teamsters. We look to the day when they shall resume their historic role within our State Federation.

At this same meeting, the executive council voted to comply with the directives for the disaffiliation of the Bakery and Confectionery Workers and Laundry

Workers local unions and councils as of June 1, 1958.

Machinists

As he has done on previous occasions, your secretary attended the fourth quarterly conference of Machinists in Los Angeles on October 19, 1957. Resolutions urging Machinists local lodges to affiliate with the California State Federation of Labor were adopted. Subsequently, your secretary wrote to the lodges, enclosing membership applications, and is gratified to be able to report a good response, as a check of the list of new affiliations in Part VIII of this report will reveal.

Organizational Assistance

The services of the Federation's organizer were made available to numerous affiliates during the year in connection with organizational problems. In addition, financial assistance was rendered to Barbers No. 837 in Van Nuys to further its organization campaign. Financial assistance was also continued to the Five Counties Central Labor Council in northern California, where fine progress is being made organizationally in the large area within the council's jurisdiction.

A contribution was made to the Palm Springs Organizing Committee and representatives were assigned to the area. Vice President James L. Smith has reported substantial progress, with continual activity and assistance on the part of the labor movement.

The Federation cooperated with the AFL-CIO Seine and Line Fishermen's Union when the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union made an attempt to take over the AFL-CIO fishing and fish cannery jurisdictions in southern California. The attempt failed, however, and the dispute was settled to the satisfaction of the AFL-CIO union.

Montgomery Ward Strike

A four and a half months' strike of national scope and significance began in January of this year, when, with negotiations in Chicago deadlocked, the Retail Clerks International Association declared a nationwide strike and boycott against Montgomery Ward. Such action had been unanimously endorsed the preceding month by the AFL-CIO convention, and was based upon a report submitted by a special subcommittee that took part in the negotiations, consisting of Joseph

Keenan of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and James Carey, of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers.

Full support of the strike was immediately pledged by our Federation, and throughout the state the labor movement rallied behind the Clerks. Conduct of the strike in California, where an economic picket line in Whittier and educational picket lines were placed in front of Montgomery Ward stores in several other California cities, was organized and directed by the California State Council of Retail Clerks. Efforts of the federal Conciliation Service to reopen negotiations were met with the company's flat refusal to budge from its pre-strike stand or to accept arbitration proposals.

From the beginning of negotiations the company refused to consider a wage increase, a uniform five-day week, overtime, and joint bargaining by the more than 60 local unions representing Ward employees. In April, it announced that it would not rehire any of the Retail Clerks members, who had then been on strike for nearly four months. Nevertheless, on May 26 an agreement was reached, which included a modified union shop, an across-the-board wage increase, a cost-of-living clause, a seniority provision, a forty-hour week, re-employment of all striking employees and dissolution of all legal actions against each other by the company and the union.

III LEGISLATION

The recession and its resulting unemployment, the plight of the farm workers, unusually important water and power issues, and taxation in California dominated the Federation's activities in the field of both state and federal legislation. Space will permit neither a listing of all the legislative matters with which we were concerned, nor a detailed account of our action in connection with the subjects here reported. A comprehensive view will be afforded, however, of the scope of our interests and the work we performed in furtherance of the Federation's long-established policies on these various issues.

Recession and Unemployment

Throughout the fall and winter of 1957-58 the recession deepened, with the national Administration not only at odds over what or who was to blame for it, but apparently unwilling or unable to take

steps either to halt or reverse the trend, or to alleviate the situation for those hardest hit—the laid-off and unemployed workers. Charges from advocates of the “wage inflation” theory that organized labor was responsible for “inflationary pressures” bringing on the recession through its efforts to meet rising prices with increased wages were contradicted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures which indicated the reverse—that prices were pulling up wages. But the recession continued and grew worse; by the thousands, workers exhausted their unemployment benefits; and still nothing was done.

By the beginning of 1958, it was evident that if the downward trend of the economy continued unabated, California would probably be hit much harder than most parts of the country, due to the steady and rapid population increase, which has been adding some 150,000 workers to the state's labor force each year. The situation in our state was analyzed by your secretary in the round-up of economic conditions compiled by the United Press in January. The analysis culminated with a warning by your secretary that, because our state was suffering, along with the rest of the country, from a lack of consumer purchasing power to buy the increased product of industry, remedial measures must be taken immediately if a crisis was to be averted.

On the last day of February, your secretary, in the following letter addressed to Governor Goodwin J. Knight on behalf of our Federation, asked him to call a special session of the legislature and initiate certain state governmental programs to stem the recession in California:

February 28, 1958

Honorable Goodwin J. Knight
Governor of California
Sacramento, California.
Dear Governor Knight:

It is the considered position of the California State Federation of Labor that the impact of the current recession on our state's economy can no longer be ignored.

Within the past several months unemployment in California has more than doubled. At 374,000 last month, the number of jobless in the state was 65 per cent higher than a year ago and accounted for 6.4 per cent of the state's labor force. This is the highest level of unemployment for any January since the severe recession of 1950.

Over the year, employment in the state has not only failed to expand sufficiently to absorb our growing labor force, but has actually declined some 21,000 to a level of 5,457,000 in January. During the same period, California's labor force expanded by 146,000, thereby accounting for the tremendous increase in the number of jobless workers.

According to the labor market reports of the Department of Employment, it is apparent that the recession has spread through virtually all parts of the economy, with qualified unemployed workers exceeding labor demand in practically all occupations. As expected, however, manufacturing and construction have been the hardest hit segments of the economy. In the face of our growing labor force, employment in these vital industries, as of last month, dropped 51,000 and 19,000 respectively below the employment level of a year earlier. On top of this, the workweek has been slashed in many instances, thus contributing to a growing army of partially unemployed workers who are not even considered in the official jobless figures.

Indeed, the employment and unemployment statistics available are a poor index of the real impact of the current recession on the thousands of unemployed workers and their families.

As a nation—as a state—we have been boastful of the progress made during the past two decades in the direction of alleviating the hardship which befalls the jobless worker and his family during periods of economic decline and temporary periods of unemployment.

Unemployment insurance has been the most important and effective vehicle developed in this regard. Yet, last month when the jobless in the state numbered 374,000, unemployment insurance claims paid averaged only 215,757, or less than 58 per cent of the number of unemployed. But this is not all. The level of benefits paid to the fortunate 58 per cent averaged only 35 per cent of average weekly wages in covered employment.

Such a low rate of wage-loss compensation paid to slightly more than half of the jobless can hardly be said to conform with the purposes of the unemployment insurance program. Further, the rate of increase in the exhaustion of unemployment benefits

in recent months has been staggering. Claimants who exhausted their benefits in January numbered 8,694—an average of about 1,900 a week. This is a 70 per cent increase in the exhaustion rate over the average for the last half of 1957, and the rate of exhaustion in the last half of 1957 was itself 79 per cent greater than in the comparable period of 1956.

The state is unprepared to cope with this new and deepening crisis. The growing number of destitute jobless who are deprived of unemployment coverage or who have exhausted their pitiful benefits and what little savings they may have been able to accumulate in a rare instance have no place to go but to county agencies to take the equivalent of a "pauper's oath" necessary to qualify for indigent county aid. For many, only the more dreaded sight of starving children is sufficient motivation to send a breadwinner to the county to accept the galling humiliation which too frequently is made an extra-legal condition of indigent aid.

According to the latest report of the Department of Social Welfare, there were 14,384 more people receiving county indigent aid in December 1957 than the previous month. The December figure, outdated as it is, was 20 per cent greater than November, and 91 per cent higher than December 1956.

Again, the figures do not tell the whole story. The newspapers up and down the state are daily reporting the exhaustion or near exhaustion of county relief funds, and a concomitant tightening up on the administration of rapidly dwindling moneys. Under such conditions, reported aid figures serve little more than to indicate the magnitude of the mounting problem.

In calling these facts to your attention, we are, of course, aware that the recession which has overtaken the economy is national in scope, requiring immediate action by the federal government. In this regard, we are actively pressing for the anti-recession program enunciated recently by the Executive Board of the AFL-CIO.

The necessity of federal action, however, does not relieve the state of its responsibility to take concurrent action. On the contrary, there is much that can and must be done immediately both to ease the plight of the jobless and to stimulate employment in the state.

As Governor and the executive

leader of the State of California, we respectfully request that you exercise your responsibility for the development of a comprehensive program of action to help combat the current recession that is stifling the California economy, and to alleviate the many hardships which this recession has imposed upon thousands of residents of the state.

In accordance with your Constitutional authority, we urge, as a minimum program, that a special session of the California Legislature be called to act upon the following items:

1. Complete liberalization of the state unemployment insurance program to: (a) extend coverage of the law to all wage and salary workers; (b) increase the maximum weekly benefit amount within a revised schedule, as repeatedly recommended by the Eisenhower Administration, so that the vast majority of claimants will be compensated for at least 50 per cent of their wage loss (a maximum benefit equal to about two-thirds of average wages in covered employment would be necessary to accomplish this minimum goal); (c) extend from 26 to 39 weeks the maximum duration of benefits for all those able and available for work; and (d) provide an additional extension in the duration of benefits for so-called older workers above the age 45 who are frequently labor market victims of age discrimination.

The balance in the Unemployment Fund at the end of 1957 was almost \$1 billion. This balance has been accumulated in spite of the fact that employer contributions in the past five years have averaged less than 1.5% of taxable wages, or half the amount originally imposed to finance the program. We sincerely believe that the time has come to face up to the issue of whether the unemployment insurance program is to serve as a system of tax reductions for employers, or whether the funds are to be used, as they were intended, for the benefit of jobless workers.

2. Activation of the State Relief Act of 1945, which provides for state financial assistance to counties in the administration of general relief aid during periods of economic emergencies, such as the present recession. The activation of this standby law requires the recognition and declaration of the existence of an emergency by both you, as Governor, and the Legislature, and the appropriation of emer-

gency aid to the counties. Such aid, in an amount necessary to meet the growing relief needs of the counties upon exhaustion of local funds, should be obtained from current reserves of some \$150 million in so-called tideland oil revenues in the Investment Fund.

3. Transfer of the balance of the accumulated reserves in the Investment Fund to the Postwar Unemployment and Construction Fund, or a comparable fund, to launch and accelerate planned programs for the construction of public works projects and improvements at both the state and local level as a means of alleviating unemployment in all parts of the state.

4. As a necessary means of increasing consumer purchasing power, enactment of a statutory minimum wage law establishing a minimum of \$1.25 per hour for all wage and salary workers, including agricultural workers, males as well as women and minors.

In addition to the above four-point program for urgency action, it is necessary that immediate attention be given to the solution of some of the basic problems in the state which have contributed immensely to the present recession. One of the most important of these, and appropriate for state action, is the depressed state of the residential construction industry in the face of a steady population increase and expanding housing needs and demands. Better than 300,000 jobs are dependent upon this industry, which is lagging seriously under the weight of tight money policies.

Solution to the joint problem of keeping this important industry on an even keel and meeting housing needs, requires a fresh approach to the housing problems of the state. There can be no solution if in our housing programs we continue to skirt the middle-income housing market where the unsatisfied demand for housing exists. Our history of postwar housing construction, even in periods of an adequate supply of mortgage money, is one of almost complete failure to reach the middle-income market of greatest demand.

We are therefore recommending immediate appointment of a Governor's Citizens' Committee on Housing to study all phases of the housing problem and to make specific recommendations for a state program necessary to meet housing needs and maintain stability in the residential housing con-

struction industry. Specifically, the committee should be instructed to review and make recommendations on the need for a new source of long-term, low-interest loans for the construction of private and cooperative sales and rental housing within the means of middle-income families currently priced out of the housing market. Such a committee, with adequate staff, should be broadly representative of the construction industry, organized labor, housing consumers, and the public at large.

Finally, it is of vital importance that immediate attention be given to the development of a state planning program which will assure balanced growth of the state. Balanced growth through planned development of our limited natural resources and other resources of the state is essential to the maintenance of full employment in an expanding economy. Yet this state has no functioning planning agency to do the job that must be done.

We therefore urge the appointment within your administration of an inter-departmental committee, working in cooperation with a citizens' advisory committee on planning and the appropriate Interim Committees of the Legislature, to proceed immediately with the development of legislative proposals for the creation of a State Planning Office, which will have as its major functions: (1) the coordination and promotion of physical and economic planning at all levels of government in the state; (2) the preparation and maintenance of an up-to-date state development plan that would be the state equivalent of the local "master plan"; (3) the promotion of full employment through state employment and production budgets submitted annually to the Legislature; and (4) the promotion of regional "master planning." In this regard, we specifically recommend favorable consideration of the model state and regional planning law developed by the Council of State Governments.

The recommendations for a state planning agency, as well as those of the proposed Governor's Citizens' Committee on Housing, should be completed for submission to the 1959 General Session of the California Legislature.

Time is of the essence. The state can no more afford to put off working toward the solution of long-term problems of stability and full employment

than it can ignore the immediate plight of thousands of jobless workers on the streets today. We must extend immediate aid to the jobless and simultaneously work toward lasting solutions.

Respectfully yours,

/s/C. J. HAGGERTY

Unfortunately, none of these proposals were included in the call for the extraordinary session.

AFL-CIO Economic and Legislative Conference

At a meeting on February 9, 1958, the executive council of the national AFL-CIO adopted an anti-recession program in conjunction with the issuance of a call for an emergency AFL-CIO economic and legislative conference to be held in Washington, D. C., on March 11, 12 and 13, 1958. A point-by-point summary of the anti-recession program follows:

(1) Unshackle expenditures for defense and foreign aid programs from the inhibitions caused by budget balancing obsessions.

(2) Raise the level of consumer buying power through vigorous collective bargaining actions by winning higher wages and increased income.

(3) Protect the American consumer from the high prices rigged by the few giant corporations exercising monopoly control in vital sectors of the economy.

(4) Raise federal minimum standards for state unemployment insurance programs so that benefits, coverage, and duration of benefits may be brought up to standards of decency.

(5) Stimulate economic growth through governmental monetary policies enabling home purchasers, small businesses, rural cooperatives, state and local governments to borrow money at low interest rates.

(6) Enact a federal program of assistance to meet the special needs of communities suffering from chronic distress.

(7) Immediately increase the personal income tax exemption by 100 dollars as a quick stimulant to mass purchasing power and, thus, lagging consumer sales.

(8) Restore building industry to maximum production while meeting urgent public needs through immediate enactment of a vast federal school construction aid program, acceleration of public housing and urban renewal programs,

and the construction of other long needed public facilities, including reclamation projects.

(9) Raise the living standards of America's neediest families by an immediate and broad extension of coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act and an increase in the federal minimum wage to \$1.25 per hour.

(10) Immediately improve the federal social security system to provide adequate benefits for the aged, the permanently disabled, and temporary victims of accidents and disease.

The California State Federation of Labor was represented by your secretary at the emergency conference, which was attended by some 1,000 state, central council, local union and international delegates representing every section of the nation. Out of the conference came a direct appeal to President Eisenhower for immediate action to relieve the deepening economic crisis. The eight-man executive committee of the AFL-CIO told the President that it was neither necessary nor wise to wait for the next month's unemployment figures before taking action.

Recession Continues

Figures released in March 1958 on unemployment in California during February showed an increase of 75 per cent since February 1957. The 449,000 jobless workers represented 7.7 per cent of the state's labor force; a year earlier, when the recession was already underway, only 4.5 per cent of the labor force had been unemployed. One out of every thirteen workers was without a job, as compared with one out of twenty-two in February, 1957.

It was becoming increasingly certain that an extraordinary session of the California Legislature would accomplish little, if anything, in the way of propping up the sagging economy or relieving the unemployment crisis, and neither the Congress nor the Administration had yet taken action on any of the many measures that had been proposed. The dread word "depression," instead of "recession" was heard more and more frequently, especially from the unemployed workers who had come to the end of their unemployment benefits, and with no jobs in sight, were facing a future strongly reminiscent of the early 1930's.

Knowing that this constituted the most urgent and immediate problem, your secretary, on March 24, 1958, wired Con-

gressman Wilbur D. Mills, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, requesting a hearing before that committee on *any* proposed federal legislation to extend the duration and improve the benefits of unemployment compensation. But the Congress was moving slowly.

A study of job data for March collected by the U. S. Departments of Commerce and Labor, underlined our difficulties in California. Three out of five of the nation's five million workers made idle by the recession were located in just eight states: New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and California. Although lesser percentages of their work forces were idled than in some other states, such as Michigan and Maine, three states—New York, Pennsylvania and California—had the greatest number of workers without jobs.

While Congressional committees held hearings on remedial legislation, suggestions, both good and bad, came forth from various sources. Among these were a proposal for a four-day work week as a possible cure and prevention of recessions, a reduction in personal income taxes for low and middle-income persons, and a price-wage freeze, which was immediately blasted by the AFL-CIO with the simple comment that if there were a proper balance between wages and prices and profits, we would not be in trouble—and we would not have more than five million unemployed people as of April 1958.

The executive council of the California State Federation of Labor, meeting in May undertook a lengthy discussion of current unemployment, at the conclusion of which, the following petition to the U. S. Senate was unanimously adopted:

The Executive Council of the California State Federation of Labor requests the U. S. Senate to give full support to the enactment of urgently needed improvements in unemployment insurance, including raising the benefit amounts, extending the weekly duration, and broadening coverage for the emergency crisis and for the future, as well as by the enactment of federal standards for state laws, in order that the purchasing power of our community be maintained, that recovery be encouraged, and the plight of millions of wage and salary workers and their families be alleviated.

This petition was promptly dispatched to Washington, D. C.

Congressional Action

The various proposals to halt the recession and start the economy on its way back to health, and in the meantime relieve the suffering caused by unemployment, had finally—in the face of no action at either the state or local level—boiled down to two “musts” for Congressional action: an extension in duration and an increase in the amount of unemployment insurance benefits, and an immediate tax reduction of \$6 to \$8 billion for low- and middle-income consumers. Enactment of both was repeatedly urged upon Congress by organized labor.

When Congress finally acted in June, however, it ignored tax reduction entirely, and passed an unsatisfactory, Administration-backed emergency bill providing only for a 50 per cent extension of the duration of unemployment benefits in those states which agreed to this extension. A second measure appropriating \$665,770,000 to finance the extension followed. Both were signed into law by the President.

The unemployment insurance measure was condemned by labor as a cruel sham and hoax on the jobless because any state could ignore its unemployed and refuse to take part in the program. Many states did not want to be obliged to repay the money advanced them by the federal government; many other states had to obtain the sanction of their legislatures, or even amend their constitutions—an even lengthier process—before they could accept advances of federal money. How many states failed to take advantage of even this inadequate means of easing the hardships of their unemployed is not yet known.

On the day the President signed the unemployment insurance extension law, a telegram was dispatched to Governor Knight by your secretary, on behalf of the California State Federation of Labor, requesting him to call a special session of the legislature for the purpose of authorizing the extended duration of unemployment benefits under the new federal law for the unemployed California workers. Subsequently, it developed that administrative action was all that was required for this purpose under the California law. The unemployed in our state have therefore had at least this much assistance during this difficult period.

Recession Continues

Through a confusion of hopeful assertions that the recession has “bottomed out,” that employment is “up” and unemployment “down,” it has been difficult but

not impossible to assess the degree of seriousness remaining in the recession. The situation has unquestionably improved somewhat in recent months, but not nearly as much or as soundly as some would have us believe. Regarding it soberly, with due consideration given to such important factors, disregarded by the optimists, as seasonality, comparative statistics and the like, the most one can safely say is that the situation has not grown appreciably worse. At this writing, the recession is still with us, and it is still serious.

Much has been made of increased production and similar indications of economic recovery, but unemployment remains the most closely watched indicator of the recession, and the prime consideration for labor. Yet unemployment figures must not be hastily taken at face value.

Thus, national unemployment decreased in April and again in May this year, and in some quarters, it was pointed out that the drop was greater than the seasonal decrease which normally accompanies the start of warmer weather. There was, however, an additional reason for the decrease: thousands of unemployed workers were vanishing from the statistical summaries of unemployment only because they had exhausted their extended unemployment benefits, but they were still jobless.

In June, national unemployment hit a seventeen-year high, increasing by 533,000 to a total of 5,437,000, the largest number of jobless workers in the nation since August, 1941. The following month the rate of unemployment in the United States had risen from 6.8 per cent of the labor force in mid-June to 7.3 per cent, although normally a sizable drop in unemployment occurs between June and July. August figures, the latest available at this writing, have shown little improvement. Total unemployment stood at 4,699,000, or 6.7 per cent of the available U. S. work force.

California unemployment in May, 1958, was 368,000, or 6.2 per cent of the labor force. This was 101 per cent higher than the figure for May, 1957. The totals showed little change during June and July, when employment levels are usually high. By August, unemployment had eased down to 335,000, or 5.5 per cent of the labor force. And in September, normally the month of least unemployment in California, there were still 303,000 jobless, representing 5 per cent of the labor force. The September, 1957, figures had shown only 163,000 unemployed.

These figures are disquieting, to say the least. Barring any sudden and unexpected development, the outlook for California

during the months to come cannot be regarded as encouraging.

Agricultural Workers

Our legislative efforts on behalf of the agricultural workers were, mainly, concentrated on two issues: the extension of federal minimum wage and maximum hours protection to these workers through amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and a renewal of our long struggle to safeguard the employment rights, and the wages and hours of domestic farm workers against the determination of growers to replace domestic workers with agricultural labor imported from Mexico, Japan, the Philippines and elsewhere.

Extension of FLSA

In November, 1957, the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor held six hearings in California on a proposed extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act embodied in HR 4575 and HR 4696: San Francisco, November 7; Oakland, November 8; Salinas, November 12; Fresno, November 13; Los Angeles, November 14-15; San Diego, November 18.

As soon as the schedule of hearings was made available, your secretary wrote to all the central labor bodies, advising them of the hearings, and urging all unions concerned with this matter to participate in and have representatives present at the hearings.

The following statement was presented by your secretary on behalf of the California State Federation of Labor at the hearing in San Francisco on November 7, 1957:

Statement of Extension of Fair Labor Standards Act

My name is C. J. Haggerty, secretary-treasurer of the California State Federation of Labor. Our organization embraces more than 1,300,000 workers in California—workers in virtually all crafts and occupations. As such, our interest in the expansion of coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to millions of now unprotected low-paid workers extends to the entire coverage question, rather than to any particular aspect of it.

We are fully aware, of course, of the extensive body of information placed before your committee by the AFL-CIO in Washington covering the overall question of coverage extension. It is not my intent in my testimony to duplicate what the AFL-CIO has already presented in great detail. The California labor movement fully supports the position of the AFL-

CIO. We are pleased that your subcommittee has made a decision to come to the West Coast to determine for itself how pressing an issue the extension of coverage actually is.

The scope of the issue, I think, has been fairly adequately delineated. Of the 20 million workers now outside the shelter of the Fair Labor Standards Act, about half—slightly more than 10 million workers—are employed in intrastate commerce by small business firms or as hired hands on small farms of the nation. Despite their need, these categories of workers fall outside the legislative scope of Congress. This leaves approximately 10 million workers involved in interstate enterprises which clearly fall within federal jurisdiction.

Who are these people? As AFL-CIO President Meany has pointed out, "They are the forgotten men and women in our economy—the clerks in the big chain stores, telephone company employees, restaurant and hotel workers, and those agricultural and processing workers employed by the big corporation farms."

Many of these workers have neither the protection of the law nor a trade union. Simply and frankly stated, they are being exploited. Their wages are set at the lowest possible level to which their employers can force them. In our opinion, they are entitled, by every test of humanitarianism and justice, to the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act. We sincerely hope that when your tour is completed that they will no longer be the forgotten men and women of our economy.

The scope of two of the bills before you come close to meeting the needs for extension coverage to the 10 million workers of which I speak. These bills, of course, are **HR 4575** and **HR 4696**, which we fully support. Although there is some disagreement between the Department of Labor and the AFL-CIO in regard to the scope of these bills, the differences appear to be minor in nature. Secretary Mitchell has testified that they would extend coverage to about nine of the ten million falling within the potential scope of the law under what we would consider a conservative definition of interstate commerce. The AFL-CIO estimates that the bills would broaden coverage of the wage and hour law to cover 9.4 million workers. The breakdown, however, is what is important. The largest numbers would be in retailing and service (including hotels, laundries and cleaners), where 3.9 million more workers would be protected; agriculture, 1.5 million; construction, 1.4 million, and outside salesmen, 1.3 million.

It is our understanding that your committee is primarily concerned with receiving testimony from each of the coverage groups involved in the extension proposals. Therefore, rather than attempting to span areas of coverage which can be better handled by field representatives of the labor organizations involved who plan to testify before your committee, it is our intent to further restrict our testimony to coverage areas least able to bring representatives before you. Most significant of the latter groups are the hired farm workers who are completely denied the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I think it should be made clear that we have not come here to ask Congress to enact a pay raise for union members. The wage standards of union members for the most part are considerably above the present \$1.00 per hour minimum wage. We are here speaking for the unorganized worker who, because he is unorganized, must look to Congress for alleviation of his substandard conditions.

The hired agricultural worker, perhaps more than any segment of our working population, is most in need of the Act's protection. This is so not only because of his low wages, but also because of the failure of virtually the entire body of social legislation of the past two decades to reach those victims of callous inaction.

Minimum wage protection is only part of that social legislation. Since agricultural workers are not covered under unemployment insurance, for example, they have no income to fall back on when they are out of a job. Yet most of them are employed in highly seasonal work and are without work a good part of the year. Further, because they are exempt from coverage under the National Labor Relations Act, they have no bargaining power and are completely at the mercy of their employers. All attempts of farm workers to organize into unions have been met with the most violent resistance by organizations of large farm employers and other powerful interests, such as the Associated Farmers in California.

What is perhaps most disturbing is the free and easy manner in which the so-called agricultural exemption is inserted in virtually every piece of social legislation enacted. It is almost as if there is something special or sacred about working with the soil that gives the farmer a moral right to run roughshod over the human rights of less fortunate individuals. In recent years, we have heard a considerable amount about "parity" for the farm operator. But what about the farm work-

er? It is high time in this talk of parity that consideration be given to the agricultural worker, and that steps be taken to elevate him in America to a position of "parity" and legal rights and dignity with his fellow workers in other trades and industries. The place to start, we believe, is with the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I have with me the latest California Weekly Farm Labor Report covering the week ending October 26, 1957. The report is issued weekly by the California State Department of Employment and contains the wage finding of the Department used by the Bureau of Employment Security in arriving at wages for contract nationals imported from Mexico under Public Law 78. The breakdown is by area and crop activity showing, in addition to wages, the approximate acreage planted, the per cent of the crop completed at the time of issuance of the report, the peak period of the crop activity, the end of the period of crop activity, the number of workers involved in the particular activity, and the peak labor requirement for the activity. A brief review of the latest report will suffice to demonstrate the shockingly low rates which prevail in California agriculture—a state, incidentally, in which agricultural wage rates, with few exceptions, are the highest in the nation.

In the southern desert area consisting of Imperial and the eastern portion of Riverside county, the most common wage rate is 70-75c an hour. In the coastal area, which includes Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, San Diego, Santa Barbara and Ventura counties, and the western portion of Riverside county, the rates in general are about 5-10c higher than the desert area. Only in one instance of a crop activity—hay and alfalfa in Los Angeles—is the most common wage rate above \$1.00 per hour. In the central coastal area, which includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Santa Cruz counties, the most common wage rate approaches closer the \$1.00 minimum. But in at least half of the activities, the rates are less than \$1.00, generally between 80c and \$1.00 per hour. In the San Joaquin Valley, the most common field activity rate appears to be \$1.00, although it is not unusual to find rates of 85 and 90 cents per hour. As we move northward, of course, the wage pattern increases, and rates under \$1.00 become the exception rather than the rule. Nevertheless, in each of the northern crop areas, you will find one or two crop activities paying less than the present minimum.

As you know, the plight of the hired

farm hand in California has been compounded many times by the importation of cheap foreign workers to the point of driving the domestic workers from the fields and forcing greater and greater dependence upon imported labor. This most unhealthy situation can be partially corrected by bringing domestic farm workers within the umbrella of wage and hour law protection and by more adequate enforcement of Public Law 78 and the international agreement under which the exploited Mexican nationals are brought into this country. Surely the agricultural worker has every right to expect action by Congress to relieve his plight. The failure of Congress to do so would leave only one alternative—that of resorting to the International Labor Organization seeking an international convention on agricultural workers. It would be sad indeed for the great champion of democracy to be put in such bad light before dominant underprivileged peoples of the world.

It was just eight years ago that nine children died of malnutrition in the farm labor camps of southern California. It was just two months ago that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People confirmed labor charges regarding the shocking conditions of worker exploitation found in labor camps of Yuba and Sutter counties. We urge that this committee study the formal complaint filed on this matter with the Vice President of the United States by the NAACP. This report showed that in one orchard labor camp, for example, occupied solely by Negroes, more than 25 families were living in dirt-floor tents; there was one water faucet for all purposes and two showers provided for men and women were situated in a small sheet iron shed for which there was no sewer outlet; toilets consisted of outside affairs set up in a ditch about 25 yards from the tents; all families were forced to prepare their food on makeshift stoves in the open; refuse and debris in the camp were running over the sides of several oil cans provided as receptacles; there were no laundry facilities available; a number of persons were still suffering from dysentery which had hit the camp the previous week.

The plight of the farm workers is indeed a national scandal. Once again, if Congress remains indifferent to the fate of our fellow Americans in the farm, we are morally obliged to make this a matter for international action.

I think it also significant to point out, in regard to the extension of wage and hour law protection to agricultural work-

ers, that today a large portion of farm workers are employed on large scale mechanized farms which do not bear the slightest resemblance to the small family farms. These big business farms have been aptly described as "factories in the fields." Workers in these farms are hired and paid in the same manner as factory workers and may be discharged or laid off whenever the employer desires. Most of them are engaged in work which is not very different from the unskilled jobs in factories which are covered by minimum wage legislation.

In California, specifically, the movement toward large scale, corporate type farm operations is generally recognized as being the most advanced in the nation. As indicated by the figures that follow, taken from the latest official census of California agriculture for 1954, the bulk of hired farm hands are employed by the relatively small proportion of large scale commercial farm enterprises.

Hired Workers on Commercial Farms by Value of Farm Products Sold

Value of Products Sold	No. of Farms	% of Com- mercial Farms	No. of Hired Workers	% of Hired Workers
All Farms	38,042	100.0%	270,624	100.0%
\$25,000 and over	14,937	39.3%	171,169	63.3%
\$10,000-\$24,999	9,906	26.0%	48,793	18.0%
\$ 5,000-\$ 9,999	6,094	16.0%	25,240	9.3%
\$ 2,500-\$ 4,999	4,191	11.0%	16,177	6.0%
\$ 1,000-\$ 2,499	2,426	6.4%	8,119	3.0%
\$ 250-\$ 999	488	1.3%	1,126	0.4%

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, Agricultural Census for California, 1954.

It is clear in the above table that the federal government does not have to reach down into the small operations to give protection to the majority of hired farm workers on commercial farms. Even a very conservative definition of an interstate farm operation would extend federal jurisdiction and protection to the majority of hired farm workers. By the same token, the so-called administrative burden, which is more a sham than anything, is much smaller than many would have you believe.

All this, of course, is not meant to leave you with the impression that the smaller commercial farm operators should not be required to pay a living minimum wage. On the contrary, we can see no reason whatsoever for a double legal or moral standard. What we do recognize is that federal jurisdiction should not go all the way, and that where federal jurisdiction leaves off, state jurisdiction should commence and be exercised.

This, in essence, summarizes our position with regard to the two bills I have mentioned that are before you. They are fair bills which realistically approach the federal-state jurisdiction question. The

issue in wage and hour legislation is not whether certain workers should have the protection and others not. We have yet to find a man who can morally justify such a position. The issue, rather, is a question of exercising jurisdiction, and we sincerely believe that Congress will be cognizant of its obligations to the people in this respect.

Congress adjourned without taking any action on these proposed amendments.

Imported Farm Workers

Hearings by the House Agriculture Committee's Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies and Manpower were conducted in Riverside and El Centro on February 28 and March 1, 1958, on the subject of seasonal agricultural labor, and particularly on the continuation of the agreement covering the importation of Mexican farm labor.

No advance notice of these hearings was given to the California State Federation of Labor or to California organized labor generally. Only at the last moment, therefore, did your secretary request the Federation's Vice President James Smith of Riverside and Walter Welden, secretary of the central labor council in El Centro, to attend the hearings, and if possible, protest the lack of advance notice. At the same time, Dr. Ernesto Galarza of the National Agricultural Workers Union, AFL-CIO, was apprised of the situation. Brother Galarza replied promptly that he would arrange to have representatives present at the hearing from the farm labor work force.

The announced purpose of the subcommittee was to obtain the views of local producers and of the workers themselves on the conditions under which imported Mexican farm labor is brought in for seasonal work; how the Mexican agreement was working; whether the program was needed, should be continued, or should be abandoned.

In the face of the committee's apparent intention to exclude labor from the hearings, evidenced by its failure to give the labor organizations sufficient notification, your secretary immediately sent a telegram to President Eisenhower, with a copy to Congressman E. C. Gathings, chairman of the subcommittee, and issued the following statement, which included the telegram, to the press:

Statement of C. J. Haggerty Relative To Use of Imported Mexican and Japanese Farm Workers

California's dangerous unemployment

crisis requires that the Eisenhower Administration immediately halt the importation of foreign contract farm workers from Mexico and Japan.

Our basic position protesting the importation of foreign workers during periods of domestic unemployment has become more and more an issue of logic and justice.

State government statistics reveal that 374,000 Californians were unemployed in January. The number has increased since the publishing of those figures. The January 1958 figure is 65 per cent higher than one year ago. The number of workers unemployed represents 6.4 per cent of the total labor force.

It is shocking that in the face of such rising unemployment that the Eisenhower Administration would cooperate with great landed interests in establishing a cheap farm labor market.

The federal law regulating the importation of Mexican and Japanese farm workers to California makes it illegal to bring in foreign workers when unemployed Americans are available for work.

Thousands of Mexican and Japanese farm hands, most of them employed under terms of savage exploitation, are holding farm jobs for which free American labor is available.

We have long noted that the shortage of domestic labor in agricultural areas is purely artificial in that growers will not pay a decent wage or provide American standards of employment with respect to hours, sanitation, safety, unemployment insurance, disability insurance, and social security protection.

In the present economic crisis which President Eisenhower now concedes faces America it is shameful that the farm labor market should be subjected to such callous exploitation.

Union charges that farm employers and their associations in California are profiting illegally from the insurance and feeding of Mexican workers should be studied by Congress. The California State Federation of Labor calls for a Congressional investigation of insurance and food programs ostensibly run for the benefit of Mexicans under the contract labor program.

**Text of Wire on Foreign Labor Program
Sent by C. J. Haggerty to
President Eisenhower**

California unemployment dangerous.
California State Federation of Labor, rep-

resenting million and half workers, therefore urges immediate halt to importation of workers from Mexico and Japan. Unemployment in California reached 374,000 in January. Has increased this month. Major layoffs announced yesterday for state's auto industry. Oil industry planning layoff and shorter work week. Situation could become disastrous. Urge replacement of foreign contract workers by domestic workers. Federal law requires American workers be given such jobs. We consider it shocking that federal government would join with big growers in formation of cheap farm labor market at time when more than third of a million Californians are out of work. Also urge Congressional investigation of administration of insurance and feeding systems under Mexican contract program.

The subcommittee hearings saw the growers and labor representatives presenting diametrically opposite views.

Speaking for the growers, the president of the Imperial Valley Lettuce Growers-Shippers Association urged that Public Law 78, under which Mexican contract workers are imported, be made permanent, by striking the expiration date from the measure. Ignoring, on the one hand, the nearly 400,000 workers then jobless in California, and on the other, the 27,000 Mexican contract workers and the more than 1,000 imported Japanese farm laborers then at work on California farms, he blandly asserted that the law amply protected the domestic workers.

The representative of the AFL-CIO Packinghouse Workers Union, however, did not ignore these facts. He called for out-and-out repeal of the law, due to expire on June 30, 1959, charged the California Department of Employment with failure to enforce the provisions in the law intended to safeguard the employment rights and wage levels of domestic farm workers, and characterized the program as simply a device by which the profits of the growers are increased at the expense of the domestic farm workers.

Less than a month later, apparently in response to the protests of the California unions, who were strongly backed by an AFL-CIO demand for Congress to investigate charges of maladministration and corruption in the Mexican farm labor importation program, Secretary of Labor James Mitchell issued a warning to California farmers that local job seekers should have priority in all areas over foreign workers. At the same time, he instructed the department's regional office not to approve employer requests for foreign workers

where, through additional recruitment efforts, domestic workers could be obtained, adding that in some areas the need for foreign workers could be eliminated. Although the full cooperation of employers in cutting down the number of foreign workers was asked by the Secretary of Labor, there is ample reason to believe that cooperative efforts by the employers consisted mainly of lip service, if that.

Public Law 78 was extended to June 30, 1961, despite grower efforts to make it permanent.

Your secretary is a member of the United States section of the U. S. - Mexican Trade Union Committee, which works in complete harmony with our Mexican trade union brothers on problems arising in connection with Public Law 78. Our Federation is also closely allied with the AFL-CIO National Agricultural Workers Union in attempts to eliminate the many evils existing in the Mexican contract labor program.

Water and Power

The drive to destroy the fifty-five year old excess lands provisions of federal reclamation law has increased almost unbelievably in tempo and ferocity in the past few years. The California State Federation of Labor's support of the 160-acre limitation is not only traditional and stated more and more sharply at each of our conventions year after year, but it is expressed publicly and as forcefully as possible whenever the occasion permits in statements submitted by us at hearings before Congressional committees and in letters and telegrams to members of the Congress before measures come to a vote.

It is gratifying to be able to report that we were able to hold the line on the principal measures with which we were concerned during the past year, and that the excess lands provisions are still intact.

Trinity River Project

At our September 1957 convention, the Federation took an unequivocal stand on the Pacific Gas and Electric Company's "partnership" proposal in connection with the Trinity River Dam by the adoption of **Resolution No. 14**—"Oppose P G & E 'Partnership' Program." Copies of this resolution were transmitted to President George Meany of the AFL-CIO, and when a hearing was scheduled for January 20, 1958, on **HR 6997**, the bill authorizing the P G & E "partnership," your secretary immediately telegraphed Andrew J. Biemiller, director of the AFL-CIO Department of Leg-

islation, urging him to appear at the hearing and strongly oppose the bill in line with our resolution. This request was, of course, complied with.

Your secretary also wired Congressman Clair Engle, chairman of the House Internal and Insular Affairs Committee, the California members of that committee, Congressmen B. F. Sisk, James B. Utt and Craig Hosmer, as well as Congressman Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman of the subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation. In these telegrams, your secretary referred to the position taken in our 1957 resolution, and pointed out that all so-called benefits that the P G & E claimed would result from its "partnership" proposal would actually be paid for out of the pockets of power users, including the federal government, in higher power rates; and that adoption of the proposal would disrupt the integrated operation of the Central Valley Project and its future integrated expansion. Following this hearing, no further action was taken on **HR 6997**.

San Luis Project

A statement was presented by your secretary at hearings on **S 1887**, a bill to authorize the construction of the San Luis Unit of the Central Valley Project, held in Washington, D. C., on March 17 and 18, 1958. The statement follows:

Statement in Support of Federal Construction of the San Luis Project in Strict Compliance with National Reclamation Law

In accordance with the long-established policy of the California State Federation of Labor, I appreciate the opportunity to support a request for further federal aid for water development in California, specifically for construction of the San Luis Project.

The feasibility of the San Luis Project and the absolute necessity of its construction have been established beyond all reasonable doubt. We strongly urge its immediate authorization, and that construction of the project be started as soon as possible. Both the economics of service area of the proposed project and of the state demand that this be the course of action.

We recognize and support the position that provision should be made in the authorizing legislation for coordination of the federal project with California water plans should the state enter the field of water and power development. At the same time, however, we insist

that the federal San Luis unit be constructed under reclamation law without deviation or evasion.

In this regard, we are disturbed at the outset by the text of S 1887. It is authored by Senator William F. Knowland, whose opposition to the excess land provision is well known since he joined in 1947 with former Senator Sheridan Downey to sponsor the bill rejected by the 80th Congress (S 912) that attempted to exempt the Central Valley Project. While S 1887 appears at first sight to include the excess land provision, examination of its text contradicts this first impression. On p. 2, lines 12 and 13, it reveals that federal reclamation law is to apply to San Luis Project only insofar as S 1887 does not eliminate it.

Examination of S 1887 discloses a number of efforts to eliminate reclamation law. Among these are the following:

(1) Apparently, the federal reclamation law is not to be applied to state use of federal facilities, in contradiction to the Warren Act of 1911. We believe that on page 2, line 23, after the words: "facilities of the San Luis unit," Congress should insert the words: "under the federal reclamation laws, and provided that these are legally recognized in the State of California."

(2) We believe that subsection (e) on page 5 should be stricken from the bill. Congress has not yet transferred title of the Central Valley Project works to the State of California, although the matter has been discussed. Apparently one of the reasons why no transfer has taken place is that the State of California has not declared its willingness to abide by the federal reclamation laws under which CVP was built. We see no reason, therefore, to authorize a transfer now, to take effect some years hence, of a part of what is proposed as an integral part of the Central Valley Project (S 1887, sec. 1, page 2, lines 2, 3.) The only effect is likely to be the easing of escape from federal reclamation law by unsympathetic administrators or others responsible for interpretation of law. We are opposed to this.

(3) We believe subsection (g) on page 6 should be stricken. Why should the United States have unrestricted use of jointly used facilities only during the repayment period and until the federal government transfers title to the State of California? We see

no reason for any such limitation, and oppose it.

(4) Subsection (h) on page 6 should be stricken. This proposes to give the State of California a freedom from "restriction" even greater than is afforded the federal government in subsection (g). Irrespective of this, we oppose subsection (h) as likely to give interests opposed to the excess land provision fresh opportunity to twist legal interpretations against federal reclamation law.

(5) We see no reason why Congress should abdicate its own authority and responsibility for setting the "time" and "conditions" of any transfer of title to San Luis works, and give some Secretary of the Interior in the future such authority. Recent experience with officials willing to give public resources away should furnish sufficient warning against doing this. Subsection (i) on page 6, therefore, should be stricken.

(6) Subsection (j) on pages 6 and 7 should be stricken. This appears to be another move to permit excess landowners to have their cake and eat it, too. The Reclamation Project Act of 1939 was enacted in part to give water users the benefit of lower annual water charges. Subsection (j) appears to be an effort to preserve these benefits while eliminating the excess land provision to which they are attached. We see no reason why Congress should show such special consideration.

(7) On page 7, line 25, S 1887 refers to contracts to permit use of a drainage system "by other parties" under contracts "conforming generally" to the provisions of the federal reclamation laws. We think the word "generally" should be stricken because it is a weasel word, designed to obscure the clarity which ought to characterize Congressional legislation, and apt to facilitate evasion of the law. The beneficiaries of federal reclamation law ought to conform to its provisions, period.

(8) On page 8, lines 4 and 5, section 4 of the bill authorizes agreements for participation "in construction and operation of drainage facilities designed to serve the general area." We believe that such participation should be under the terms of the excess land provision of reclamation law, and this should be stated in the bill. We believe the Committee should inquire whether this portion of section 4 is another

move on the part of excess landowners in the area to be served by the San Luis project to obtain federal aid without compliance with federal policy. "Flood control" has been used as a phrase to obtain substantial benefits in the past that are essentially for the promotion of irrigation without obligation to reimburse the federal treasury or to abide by the excess land provision. The phrase "drainage" must not be similarly employed now. We support the recommendation of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission of 1950, that "the benefits of federal financial assistance through irrigation should go only to family-sized farms," that this principle, "together with other anti-speculation and anti-monopoly provisions, should be maintained and enforced" and "should be extended" to cover "federal investment in the reclaiming of land, whether by irrigation, drainage, or other methods." We oppose this portion of section 4 as a backward step, favorable to water monopoly and speculation, destructive of broad opportunity among American citizens and injurious to the public treasury.

If the Committee is able to discover additional loopholes in S 1887 that we have missed upon this first examination of the bill, we trust it will close them.

Subsection (k) of the bill, page 7, appears particularly worthy of commendation. It is designed to assure that despite any future transfer of title to the project work, federal policy with respect to "preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife" will be observed, under penalty. We believe that the same regard shown for fish and wild life should be shown for humans, and the excess land provisions preserved with equal scrupulousness.

We realize that the Congress cannot legislate in the public interest without facing certain facts in the public record of federal reclamation aid in California. Among these are the following:

1. Excess landholders, especially those in or near the San Luis service area, have resisted application of the excess land provision with extraordinary tenacity while accepting the financial benefits of reclamation law.

2. The Secretary of the Interior has failed to obtain repayment contracts in compliance with reclamation law on Kings and Kern Rivers, although

these projects have been in operation since 1954.

3. The Controller General of the United States has called attention to those failures of excess landholders to comply with the law in his 1956 Audit Report to the Congress of the United States on Central Valley Basin, 1956, pages 33, 34.

4. Objections to compliance with the excess land law do not come from California voters and water users generally, but rather from holders of excess lands: the electors of irrigation districts in Central Valley have approved more than a score of water contracts containing the excess land provision, by an aggregate vote of around ten to one.

5. Notwithstanding Acts of the California Legislature authorizing irrigation districts to enter into contracts with the United States under the provisions of reclamation law (Cal. Water Code, para. 23175-23302), a California state engineer, officials of various water districts, and the State Supreme Court have each opposed the excess land provisions of federal reclamation law. The Court has recently forbidden irrigation districts in California to enter into contracts with the United State to comply with the excess land provision, in a decision that, according to the chairman of the House Interior Committee and five other Central Valley Congressmen, is "jeopardizing further federal reclamation projects in California and the entire west" because it "strikes at one of the basic tenets of reclamation law." (Letter from Congressman Clair Engle et al. to California Attorney General Edmund G. Brown, February 4, 1957) We are glad to state that the Attorney General of California has appealed the adverse opinion of the California Supreme Court in the Ivanhoe Case to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In face of this situation, we ask that S 1887 be amended to require signature of repayment contracts under federal reclamation law prior to expenditure of federal money for construction, and also to require that the excess land provision shall be recognized legally in California as a condition precedent to commencement of construction.

The California State Federation of Labor, in other words, favors federal construction of San Luis project, is appreciative of the generosity of the federal government under reclamation law, and insists that the law to the land be

applied to San Luis project without opening loopholes for evasion by subterfuge or otherwise.

We have noted with approval that Senator Paul H. Douglas of Illinois has protested against "piecemeal abandonment" of our traditional reclamation policy (Cong. Rec., August 9, 1957, p. 13095); also that he and Senators Wayne Morse and Richard L. Neuberger of Oregon have introduced a bill (S 1425) to repair some of the injury to national policy, and have asked for hearings on the bill. We hope that such hearings will be granted in due course and, in the meantime, that Congress will hold up S 2120 and HR 5309 (Texas, Mercedes), S 1996 (Kendrick, Wyoming), and S 2541 (Barrett Bill), all of which represent piecemeal threats to the excess land law, until the issue can be thoroughly considered.

We wish to point out that efforts to confine application of the excess land provision to "new" water, "new" land, and water originating from "a federal reclamation project" are all damaging to national policy, and should be denied by Congress.

In conclusion, the California State Federation of Labor, believing in full development of California's water resources and in the law of the land that has governed reclamation historically, supports federal construction of San Luis project under existing reclamation law. We respectfully request that this statement, with its accompanying documents, be printed in the hearings on S 1887.

The follow-up on this matter can be briefly recounted. Upon receipt of a committee print of this bill early in May from Senator Clinton P. Anderson, chairman of the Senate subcommittee that had heard the bill, and a request for our comments, your secretary replied (1) that the suggestions we had put forth in our March statement had been all but ignored, (2) that our objections applied to a new section that had been incorporated in the bill, and (3) that we still regarded S 1887 as a vehicle to destroy reclamation law.

Subsequently, in connection with a House bill proposed as a possible substitute for the House version of S 1887, your secretary wrote to Congressman Wayne Aspinall of the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, that we not only had the same objections to the proposed substitute, but it was perhaps an even worse bill from our point

of view. We charged, in fact, that this new version could well be the instrument for sacrificing the excess lands provisions of reclamation law, not only in the San Luis Project, but in the Central Valley Project as a whole.

S 1887 was passed by the Senate on August 15, 1958, but the 85th Congress came to an end before the House took any action upon it.

Support of Excess Lands Provisions

Hearings on three bills, S 1425, S 2541 and S 3448, were announced by the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation for April 30, 1958, in Washington, D. C. Your secretary prepared a statement for submission to these hearings, then, in a letter, set forth the situation involved in the consideration of these bills, the Federation's position in the matter and the underlying reasons for it. Copies of this letter were dispatched in advance of the hearings to the state federations of labor in the so-called reclamation states—Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington and Wyoming, with a request that statements be filed with the subcommittee on their behalf supporting the excess lands provisions of reclamation law against land speculation and water monopoly.

The statement filed by your secretary on behalf of the California State Federation of Labor follows:

Statement in Support of Excess Lands Provision in Reclamation Law

The California State Federation of Labor, numbering approximately 1,400,000 workers in the state, is grateful for the opportunity made possible by the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation to reaffirm our historic and uncompromising support of the nation's policies against land monopoly, and specifically, to plead for Congressional action which will restore to full force and vigor the excess lands provision of national reclamation law.

We are pleased that the Subcommittee has combined the three bills at hand for purposes of this hearing, because together they place the excess lands issue in its entirety squarely before the Senate for open and public debate.

On the one hand, we have the two bills by Senator Barrett which employ

the favorite tools of the landed monopolists to reduce the 56-year-old anti-monopoly, anti-reclamation provision of reclamation law to shambles. Recognizing Congress' refusal time and time again to repeal the excess lands provision, S 2541 proposes repeal by indirection by (1) giving legal effect to the non-enforcement techniques developed by the monopolists at the administrative level, and (2) by employing generally a form of "commutation" which would permit the sale of policy for cash in the payment of an interest charge for water used on excess lands. This measure is surely a large landowner's delight. It cuts the head right off public policy so neatly and silently that the public would not even know it until the head is seen rolling on the ground.

Senator Barrett's S 3448 is somewhat less ambitious. It takes another leaf out of the large landowners' handbook which says that if you cannot lop off the head of public policy in one fell swoop, you do it piecemeal. S 3448 applies the "administrative" subterfuge in S 2541 to the Seedskaadee reclamation project.

On the other hand, we have S 1425 by Senators Douglas, Morse and Neuberger, which supports the 56-year old excess lands provision and demands its inclusion in the Small Reclamation Projects Act in place of the "commutation" formula that Senator Barrett seeks to apply generally. S 1425, therefore, pinpoints the issue before the Senate. It is whether the Senate wants to be a party to the completion of a guillotine for use by the landed monopolists or whether it wants to join Senators Douglas, Morse and Neuberger and help tear down the partially completed edifice which those monopolists have been building.

We venture to assert that a guillotine has no place in a democracy. We demand that public policy be taken out from under the chopping block.

The Concern of Organized Labor

As indicated at the outset, organized labor has opposed giant private land holdings in California from its inception. As early as 1878, the Workingman's Party of California demanded that "land grabbing must be stopped," and in 1879 the organized workingmen from San Francisco led the fight in the California State Constitutional Convention of that year which wrote into our

present constitution that state lands shall be granted only "in quantities not exceeding 320 acres to each settler."

Nevertheless, in one way or another, huge landholdings have been amassed. The public record shows that 34 private owners of irrigable land in potential water service areas of California's Central Valley Project, none of them owning less than 5,000 acres each, owned 748,490 acres. (Hearings before Senate Public Lands Committee on S 912, 80th Congress, 1st Session). Some were individuals, some corporations.

Our answer to those who question labor's interest in how many acres there should be on a farm, is that they go down in the Central Valley and take a look at the large landholdings. As one individual summarized it:

"The name 'okie' did not come from Oklahoma; it came from the Central Valley. In communities where the farms are small, there are stores and buying power to keep the goods of factory workers moving. Where the corporation farms spread out for thousands of acres, you will find a blighted area with landless exploited hired workers who have little in their pockets to attract thriving towns and businesses. But more than that, there is the plight of the workers themselves to consider. . . . If you need one more reason, go up to Sacramento and watch the anti-social influence of the corporation farmers on progressive legislation. . . . There is more than a little of that same influence in Washington."

(Joseph D. Keenan, before San Francisco Conference of Labor's League for Political Action, 1949).

A careful study published by the Senate Small Business Committee—the famous comparison of the two Central Valley communities of Arvin and Dinuba—confirms this opinion from known conditions in California. Family size farms mean better balanced communities, more local business volume, more merchants, more churches and civic organizations, more independent farmers and fewer landless workers.

This is what is involved in the bills before this committee. The excess lands law distributes water equitably among people as a means of justifying the spending of public money for public benefits; or preventing monopoly and controlling speculation in water; and of curbing the growth of corporate farming and the concentration of

economic power. But it is more than that. Fundamentally it is a means absolutely necessary for the preservation of family-size farming and a broad base for American social and political democracy by encouraging widespread ownership of land.

National reclamation policy has been generous to the west. We find no one who wants to repeal that generosity. The largest beneficiaries seem determined only to destroy that part of national policy intended to prevent monopolization by the few of the benefits from public resources and public appropriations. In other words, they want the resources and the money, but not the policy. Organized labor believes they should not have the resources and the public aid except according to the policy.

Barrett "Interest Formula" vs. Restoration of Policy

S 2541 sets forth in Section 3 the "interest formula" for abandonment of the excess lands law. It gives excess landholders the right to receive water for their excess lands without signing a recordable contract so long as interest is paid "on that portion of the construction charges attributable to lands . . . held in excess of the land limitation provisions of reclamation law."

The interest rate to be charged would be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury "by estimating the average annual yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations of prices during the month of May preceding the fiscal year in which the loan is made, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of such month of May and by adjusting such estimated average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum at the beginning of the fiscal year preceding the date on which the contract is executed."

The formula is identical to that in the Small Reclamation Projects Act which S 1425 seeks to repeal. It is a formula that strips the law of substance and leaves shadow. It offers to sell national policy in exchange for a few pieces of money, and thereby undermines reclamation policy as "commutation" undermined the Homestead Act. The deadly effects of "commutation" were well known to the framers of reclamation policy, and that is why

Congress forbade it in the National Reclamation Act of 1902.

We frankly submit that if Congress no longer adheres to the excess lands provision in this Act, it should be honest enough to repeal the anti-monopoly anti-speculation protection outright. If as indicated by repeated rejection of repeal efforts, the contrary is true, then the interest formula must be repealed as proposed in S 1425. There is no middle ground between "commutation" and "policy," because insofar as the purpose of the excess lands provision is concerned, the two are totally incompatible.

The **Sacramento Bee** correctly tagged the formula when it was first adopted in the Small Reclamation Projects Act in 1956. Noting that the formula would more likely win favor with excess landowners than it would spread the benefits to reclamation projects and enlarge the opportunity for family size farms, the **Bee** cited a letter from the Southern Pacific Company to the Bureau of Reclamation indicating its approval of the formula. (**Sacramento Bee**, October 17, 1956.)

The letter, dated October 1, 1956, has been published in San Luis Project Hearings issued by the House in January, 1958. Its pertinent provisions read as follows:

" . . . Southern Pacific Co. owns about 65,000 acres within the Westlands Water District in Fresno and Kings counties, and an additional 55,000 acres outside of (westerly and above) said district but within the so-called San Luis service area. The company also owns about 30,000 acres in southern Kings and Kern Counties which might be served by the Feather River Project.

"These lands are not being offered for sale, but are being held for long range management purposes . . .

"Southern Pacific is not prepared to commit these lands for sale under the usual Bureau of Reclamation type recordable contract. We favor State or local development and control of water resources but welcome Federal aid provided the conditions thereof are reasonable and bearable. Further, we neither seek nor expect any Federal subsidy in the form of 40-year interest free money, but are willing to pay our fair share of the irrigation benefits provided the capital and operating costs are such that the land and crops can afford same . . ."

(Underscoring added).

The Southern Pacific, with 150,000 acres, should indeed look with favor upon the "interest formula" because it was developed over a long period of consideration of ways and means of making the excess land provision palatable to excess landholders. The Southern Pacific's letter, in effect, suggests that the formula in the Small Reclamation Projects Act should be given universal application as proposed by S 2541 (Barrett).

The comments on the formula of Congressman William A. Dawson of Utah when the Small Reclamation Projects bill was being heard before the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation bear repeating in regard to S 2541:

"... And to say that these large landowners are going to pay interest on their excess and therefore, it is going to result in breaking up the large ownerships just is not true. For this reason: that there are plenty of other benefits in this bill which they have not been receiving up to this point that they would get even though paying the interest.

"For instance, they get the advantage of the non-reimbursable items, which may be considerable, but which are not repaid . . .

"Furthermore, up until this point they are not getting in on any cheap Government money. By 'cheap' I mean if they pay interest, they are still only going to pay 2½ per cent or something in that neighborhood, which is very reasonable money. That could even be encouragement for people to get into big ownerships and to take on more acreage, because the other benefits are so great . . ."

No further comment is necessary. It is not possible to uphold the purpose of the excess lands law and at the same time support the Barrett "interest formula" unless a premium is to be placed on hypocrisy. We urge that the formula be stricken from the Small Reclamation Projects Act, as proposed in S 1425, and that its extension in S 2541 be rejected.

"Supplemental Water"—The Discredited Plea of the Monoplist

It is to be noted that S 2541, in extending the "interest formula," adds insult to injury by employing the "supplemental water" subterfuge of the landed monopolists. In this respect, the bill reads: "This proviso (interest

formula) shall be applicable only when the works of such project or division of a project deliver a supplemental supply of water for irrigation . . ."

It is almost laughable that this language should be added as if it were restrictive of the application of the "interest formula." We note, however, the absence of a definition of "supplemental" water, and recall only too vividly the efforts of the forces behind S 2541 to exempt the entire Central Valley Project of California from the excess lands law on this false premise.

No definition is necessary. We know what the old argument is—it runs like this: Reclamation law, including acreage limitation, applies only to lands which are totally reclaimed by Federal aid; it is unsuited to privately developed lands needing only supplemental water, and was never intended to apply in this case.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The public record is literally filled with declarations of those who framed and passed the national reclamation law of 1902 to the effect that the purpose of the original reclamation law was just the contrary; that is, the first purpose was to provide supplemental water to imperiled communities of private landholders, and then, if more water was available, to provide a full supply to other lands, either public or private.

It is not necessary to search this record. We need go only to the report of the Central Valley Project Studies, Problem 19, which contains a study of the acreage limitation and excess lands provision of reclamation law. After quoting a series of clear-cut declarations of the framers of our national reclamation law, the study concluded:

"These statements, and others of like character that could be cited, indicated quite clearly that the sponsors of reclamation arrived at conscious decisions (1) in favor of acreage limitation, (2) in favor of supplemental as well as primary irrigation, (3) in favor of the irrigation of private as well as public lands, and (4) in favor of steps necessary to force the breaking up of large holdings. Provisions in the Reclamation Act of 1902, respective of these points, were not there by accident or through insufficient consideration; they represented deliberate decisions based upon thorough discussion."

A study in the same report of the Central Valley Project Studies, Problem 19, on the "Legislative and Administrative History of Acreage Limitation and Control of Speculation on Federal Reclamation Projects," concludes:

"There is no difference in principle between a supplemental and a primary supply insofar as the wisdom of applying acreage limitations and anti-speculation provisions is concerned. Pressure to relax the restrictions in such cases may be viewed as a flank attack upon the whole policy. . . ."

The truth of the matter is that all irrigation provided under federal reclamation law is supplemental, and always has been, because it supplements either rainfall or underground water, or both.

Indeed, that such a broad construction of "supplemental water" might be implied in S 2541 is more than a figment of the imagination. The provision specifying the application of the "interest formula" to so-called supplemental waters reads on as follows: "or when water is delivered for the irrigation of lands which have been subjected to cultivation for the production of agriculture crops for more than ten years prior to the authorization of such project or division of a project."

Clearly, this provision exempts from the application of the excess lands provision lands that are changed by a reclamation project from dry to irrigated farming, so long as the dry farming has been carried on for ten years. No statement of the intended scope of Senator Barrett's "interest formula" could be clearer.

Administrative Power to Reject or Enforce Public Policy

There remains for consideration the proposal of S 2541 to give the Secretary of Interior, in the case of all reclamation projects, the authority to determine the "economic adequacy" of 160 acres of irrigated land for the support of "an average-sized family" and to modify this amount of acreage accordingly. As noted at the outset, essentially the same authority is granted "piecemeal" in S 3448 for the Seedskadee project.

We seriously challenge the wisdom of granting such authority on several counts.

First, we question the need for such authority at all. We are yet to be con-

vinced by arguments that 160 acres of irrigated land is not sufficient to sustain a good life for an average-sized family. We submit that if this is ever the case, the use of scarce reclamation funds to bring water to such lands would be an uneconomic expenditure to save marginal lands that should go out of production. Further, for all practical purposes we are talking about water for 320 acres of irrigable land allowed a man and wife under reclamation law—not 160 acres.

We have heard it argued on numerous occasions by the opponents of reclamation law that the 160 acre provision was written many years ago, and that farming conditions have changed. We find no quarrel with these statements, but find the logic somewhat confusing. It is our impression that the change has been in the direction of increasing the productivity of land, and not the contrary, as seems to be implied by such glib assertions. It is true that modern technology makes it possible now to farm more and more acres with less and less manpower, but no one has demonstrated that 160 or 320 irrigated acres is too small a farm to take advantage of modern mechanical equipment and other forms of advanced technology, or that such acreage is not sufficient to support a family generously if not affluently anywhere in the United States. Where more acreage is said to be required by reason of soil and climate in the service area of a proposed reclamation project, perhaps Congress would do better to question the Department of Interior's economic feasibility report of the project, rather than give him the blanket authority to increase the amount of acreage for which project water may be delivered.

In this regard, we specifically question why a request "by the Governor of an affected state" should be required in S 2541 as prerequisite for investigation and exercise of the authority granted the Secretary of the Interior.

In our opinion, this is purely loading the dice. Governors are especially vulnerable to the special interests in their desire to grab more and more land. The people who may want to protect the public interest may never hear of the pressure applied on the Governor, and therefore be precluded from any expression in the matter before the Governor acts. Further, we are talking about Federal funds. Every

Governor has an interest in getting as much "pork" out of the barrel as possible. He therefore has an active interest in raising the acreage figure in order to justify or legalize the spending of more and more Federal funds in his state on poorer and poorer land, i.e. to get more "pork."

All this, however, is only secondary to organized labor's major concern. We ask seriously, what is there in the record of the Department of Interior that justifies placing the confidence in it proposed in S 2541?

We have lived with the administration of the Central Valley Project for a considerable number of years. If we have learned anything from our experience, it is that a battle won in Washington to uphold the excess lands law is no assurance that the law will be administered by the Department. We recognize the frailty of man, but we do not think it should be tolerated in the proportions suffered in the Central Valley Project under unsympathetic administrators who have succumbed to the pressures and clever schemes of the landed monopolists devised to flout public policy.

We won in Washington against the monopolists when reclamation law was written into the Flood Control Act that admitted the Army Engineers to the Kings and Kern Rivers for the construction of Pine Flat and Isabella dams in the CVP. Some 10 years later, both dams have been constructed, but reclamation law has neither been applied nor enforced.

In regard to the Kings River, the whole story is in the files of the California State Federation of Labor—in a series of lengthy correspondence between our office and the Secretary of Interior, dating back to the beginning of the current Administration in 1953, urging against the negotiation of a repayment contract that would allow excess landholders in the Kings service area to escape the law. While we cannot conceive that the administrative authority proposed in S 2541 will be granted, we nevertheless request that should this Subcommittee be so inclined, it first review the sad record of the Department on the Kings River. The California State Federation of Labor would be pleased to make the above-mentioned series of communications available for Subcommittee study and investigation.

The fate of reclamation law on the

Kings River still hangs in the balance, and the tragedy experienced thus far may well be repeated in regard to the negotiation of a repayment contract for the irrigation benefits of Isabella dam. Again we urge your investigation prior to acting on the proposal before you.

For your further consideration, we are attaching to this statement a thoroughly documented study of the failure of enforcement of the excess lands provision on the Salt River Project in Arizona, prepared and written by Klaus G. Loewald of the University of California. We request that it be printed in the record of these hearings. This study, we believe, will remove any doubts that may exist about whether the Department of Interior can be trusted with the authority proposed.

Finally, we raise the question whether authority granted the Department in the two Barrett bills is not in actuality a delegation of the policy-formation function of Congress to the executive branch of government without any specific legislative criteria for exercise of the authority granted. The criteria spelled out in the last sentence of Section 1 of the bill relate only to the physical aspects of a family-size farm. These in turn are dependent upon what is considered to be a "suitably profitable level" of operation for the support of a family farm. The suggestion is that some unknown income standard is to be applied. Nowhere does the bill define such an income standard. Under these conditions, we respectfully submit that the bill does not contemplate a grant of administrative authority. It proposes a Congressional abandonment of policy.

A 56-year-old policy, in this centenary year of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt who, as President, inspired the excess lands provision, surely is deserving of better treatment. By the same token, 1958 is the proper year to repair the damages of previous onslaughts against Theodore Roosevelt's principle of equality of distribution embodied in the excess lands law. A long step in this direction would be the enactment of S 1425.

Supreme Court Decision

To the many who have fought long and well over the years to preserve reclamation law against the schemes of those who would destroy it, the decision handed down by the United States Supreme

Court this past summer upholding the federal 160-acre limitation in reclamation law brought immense pleasure and satisfaction. The following statement on this historic decision was issued by your secretary:

The United States Supreme Court decision upholding the 160-acre water limit gives fresh impetus to the campaign to qualify an initiative making the limitation a part of state as well as federal law. Justice Tom Clark, speaking for the court, said:

"It is reasonable to limit the amount of project water available to each individual in order that benefits may be distributed in accordance with the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals.

"The limitation insures that the enormous expenditures will not go in disproportionate share to a few individuals with large land holdings. Moreover, it prevents the use of the Federal Reclamation Service for speculative purposes."

With these words, and by a unanimous 8 to 0 opinion, the highest court in the land confirms a view that the California State Federation of Labor has held from the beginning.

As efforts are made increasingly to open the state treasury for state water project construction, it becomes increasingly necessary to bring state law into line with federal law to assure that state funds, too, will be used for the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals.

The California State Federation of Labor urges every union member, and invites all citizens to seek out an opportunity to sign the initiative petition sponsored by the California Water and Power Users' Association. Access to a petition may be had at any AFL local union in the state of California, or from the California State Grange.

(The initiative petition referred to in this statement is set forth more fully in Part IV of this report.)

State Tax Hearings

State tax and revenue problems, the serious fiscal crisis, the need for additional revenue from untapped or insufficiently used sources, the burden of the sales tax, especially on workers—these and similar matters have weighed more heavily than ever before on the citizens of California during the past year.

The position of our Federation on taxes and tax problems has been publicly stated on many occasions. This year especially, we have taken action whenever the opportunity presented itself. Our widely attacked and misjudged tax initiative, Proposition 17, is discussed in Part IV of this report. The basic motivation for this proposal was set forth in a statement on California tax and revenue problems, which was presented by President Thomas L. Pitts, on behalf of the Federation, at hearings before the Joint Interim Tax Committee of the California Legislature, held in Los Angeles, May 26-27, 1958.

Because of the continuing importance of this document, it is here set forth in full:

Statement on California Tax and Revenue Problems

We are pleased to have this opportunity to express our views concerning California's fiscal crisis, and the direction in which we believe action should be taken to meet the increased revenue needs of the state in a manner that would be fair and equitable for all taxpayers, and consistent with the needs of an expanding economy.

We are aware, of course, that Resolution 206, governing the scope of your activities, extends to local tax structures as well as that of the state. We are confining our testimony at this time, however, to state tax and revenue problems, as they relate to the fiscal crisis which the legislature must face when it convenes in general session next January.

The magnitude of the crisis needs no emphasis on our part. Less than one year ago, when Resolution 206 was adopted, it was believed that California's General Fund operating deficits would range from \$50 million to \$150 million during the years immediately ahead, as stated in the Whereas portion of the Resolution. We note in a recent Department of Finance release that the deficit facing the 1959 general session has already been upped conservatively to \$213 million. The odds are considerable that it will be still greater, but even the \$213 million represents a need for increased General Fund revenues equivalent to 18 per cent of estimated General Fund revenues for the next fiscal year. The fact is that for some time the legislature and state fiscal offices have recognized that the General Fund revenue structure has not been producing growth yields com-

mensurate with the need for state growth expenditures. And there is no reason to believe that this situation will be reversed in the future. Clearly, the task of the committee must be to provide long range solutions to the revenue needs of the state, as mandated in Resolution 206.

In this regard, I wish to make the position of the State Federation of Labor perfectly clear. We, as a federation, by convention action and by action taken before the legislature, have consistently pressed for increases in state expenditures to meet not only our normal growth needs, but also our expanding needs for new programs of a socio-economic nature. At the same time, we have accepted the inevitability of increasing state taxes and revenues. Our only insistence has been that growth needs should be handled on their merits, and that the financing problems be handled separately as a consideration of taxation in relation to the over-all revenue needs of the state. In accordance with this position, we have opposed expediency measures such as that offered at the 1957 General Session to finance increased school appropriations by the imposition of specific consumer taxes. We supported, instead, the approach being pursued by this committee. We are satisfied that there can be no other constructive alternative.

As we view the scope of your authority as it relates to state taxation, we are satisfied also that the far-reaching tax studies required of the committee will remove a large area of controversy regarding the distribution of the present state tax burden, and thereby facilitate the adoption of a tax program which will meet the specifications set forth in Resolution 206. Pending the availability of the findings of these studies, we believe there are fairly conclusive facts which at least indicate the direction in which the legislature should be looking for additional revenues.

Before the legislature, we have steadfastly opposed any and all measures designed to obtain increased revenues through the imposition of additional consumer taxes on workers who are already shouldering what we believe is a disproportionately large share of the state tax burden as a result of the dominance of the regressive sales tax in our state structure.

This is no "dog-in-the-manger" atti-

tude. On the contrary, the workers of this state are ready and willing to pay their fair share of the costs of government; not, however, in the proportions proposed before the legislature as in the cigarette and beer tax bills of the 1957 session, but rather in accordance with the sound and accepted principle of ability to pay, which unfortunately has been observed more in the "breach" than in the implementation in the recent years. In your search for additional revenues, we ask not only that the committee refrain from recommending another "breach," but that it also seek to remove the inequities in the present tax structure as they are revealed by your studies.

Those words may appear to be a bit strong, but we are content to apply value judgments of the labor movement to the facts presently available. As a percentage of General Fund revenues estimated for the 1958-59 budget, sales and excise taxes account for better than 63 per cent of revenues. By contrast, the personal income and the bank and corporation, franchise and income taxes make up only 13 per cent and 15 per cent of General Fund revenues respectively; and together they account for only 18 per cent of total state revenues.

While we do not know the exact effect of this type of lopsided tax structure, which is the reason for the necessity of the tax burden studies undertaken by the committee, there are sufficient figures available to indicate the regressive character of taxation in California.

We firmly believe that there is only one way to measure or gauge a tax as far as impact among taxpayers and income groups is concerned, and that is in terms of the effective rate of taxation. As you know, a tax or a tax structure is proportional when tax payments as a percentage of income are the same at all levels of income. It is progressive when tax payments are an increasing percentage of income when moving up the income ladder. On the other hand, it is regressive when the tax to income ratio declines with rising incomes.

Those who support consumer taxes say they are the least painful of all—"Just a few pennies at a time from anyone," they say. We are afraid, however, that the sales tax is painless only for the well-off, who pay the least proportionately. We sincerely believe that

there is a great need for some honest thought on this matter, so that the sales tax and other proposed consumer taxes may be viewed in proper perspective.

We feel that the term "regressive" has been associated so freely with the words "consumer taxes" that it has lost most of its meaningfulness to some. To organized labor, I can assure you this is not the case. The regressiveness of the consumer tax stems from the fact that it is based on consumption rather than income. The rate is the same for all, regardless of ability to pay. The poorest families cannot escape the sales levy, because exemptions and graduated taxes for rising income levels (features of a progressive tax) do not apply. In other words, those who do not have to spend all their income to maintain an acceptable standard of living pay a lower effective rate. At a point in regard to the regressiveness of consumer taxes are the findings submitted to the U. S. Congressional Joint Economic Committee in 1955 by Richard A. Musgrave, of the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan. This is the research unit that conducts annually the consumer finance surveys for the U. S. Federal Reserve Board. According to Mr. Musgrave's findings, state and local sales taxes take a larger bite from the lower income groups and a proportionately smaller tax bite all the way up the income ladder. His findings for 1954 showed that spending units with incomes under \$2,000 per year paid 5.7 per cent of their income in state sales and excise taxes, as compared with 2.2 per cent for those families with incomes of \$10,000 and over. The intermediate findings were as follows:

\$2,000-\$ 3,000 income	5.1%
3,000- 4,000 income	4.6%
4,000- 5,000 income	4.4%
5,000- 7,500 income	4.2%
7,500- 10,000 income	3.8%

Clearly, low income spending units are forced to pay an effective tax rate two and a half times greater than spending units in the upper income brackets.

It is not our contention that the figures quoted reflect accurately the distribution of the burden of the California sales taxes among income groups. Admittedly, the Musgrave study is national in scope, whereas the items excluded from general sales taxes vary considerably between states and be-

tween cities. In California, we are thankful for at least the exemption of food outside of restaurants and a few other items in the public utilities category, which tends to mitigate somewhat the unfair distribution of burden between income groups to the extent that expenditures for these exempt items constitute an increasing proportion of total expenditures as we go down the income ladder. While this may underscore the need for study to determine the effective rate of sales taxation in California, it would be wrong to assume that the exemptions for food and public utilities remove its regressive character. This would be tantamount to saying that these exemptions and others that may favor the low income groups completely offset the regressive effect of increased savings on the effective rate of taxation as we go up the income ladder, which certainly is not the case. Although the exclusions from our general sales tax have been equated by some to the personal exemptions allowed under both the federal and state income tax laws, the fact remains that the three per cent rate, plus local rates, is paid "equally" by the rich and the poor alike on expenditures only, while savings escape the tax entirely.

Apart from this escape of savings from sales taxation, the idea that there is "equality" in a "flat" sales tax rate is itself completely misleading. Actually, the cost is far more than the 3 per cent charged on each dollar's purchase. As an article titled "Penny Larceny" in the April 1956 issue of *Fortnight* put it, "Disparities in state sales tax schedules have mulcted Californians out of \$4 billion." The reason, of course, is the application of "breakage schedules" favorable to retailers on sales of less than a dollar and those of a higher amount involving a fraction of a dollar. The schedule used by retailers who collect the sales tax has some 7,709 price ranges, of which 12.17 per cent, or 938, are in error and constitute overcharges to purchasers of taxable items. There are only two errors, the *Fortnight* article points out, which favor the consumer by a one cent undercharge. Obviously, under such conditions of legalized larceny, persons who make many small purchases are frequently forced to pay the sales tax twice while they spend a dollar. These, by and large, are the lower income groups. Persons of higher income who tend to make more purchases in mul-

multiple dollar amounts may also be mulcted on fractional amounts, but generally they pay the so-called "flat" sales tax in a percentage closer to the legal imposition. Thus, the unfairness of the general sales tax as such is compounded by its unequal application at the point of collection.

It should be evident also that lower income groups fare no better under so-called selective sales taxes, or excises, as they are generally called. In this case, only specific items are taxed, usually so-called luxuries, tobacco, cosmetics, jewelry and the like. Yet, many of these items are actually "necessities" in our modern society . . . and so the major burden continues to fall on those least able to bear it.

In recent sessions of the legislature, serious consideration has been given to the imposition of a cigarette tax and to increasing the excise on beer. We note in the newspapers during the past week that these taxes are again being proposed as a means of closing the gap between General Fund revenues and expenditures. In our opinion, it would be rather difficult to conceive two consumer taxes that would be more unfair to the wage earner in regard to the distribution of the added tax burden than these two selective taxes.

Further, it would be completely wrong to equate items such as cigarettes and beer to luxuries for the purpose of taxation. In our society, where we boast so proudly of our standard of living—a standard generally above the level of subsistence—who is to say how income above that necessary to provide subsistence shall be spent, or that smoking cigarettes or drinking beer is more of a luxury than eating excessively. To adopt taxes on such a basis would be a dangerous infringement on consumer free choice, which is one of the fundamental tenets in our private enterprise economy.

Should this committee give any consideration to selective consumer taxes, we respectfully request that such impositions be viewed in the same context as the general sales tax. The reason should be apparent.

Assume for a moment that the present general sales tax applied to all expenditures and that every person spends every cent he earns. Assume further, that the tax is applied uniformly at the collection point; then, obviously, everyone, regardless of income, would pay the same amount of his income in taxes.

This, however, is not realistic because people earn enough to save some of their income and some more than others. The moment savings are introduced, the tax becomes regressive. On the other hand, as indicated earlier, the movement of items in or out of the taxable base makes the sales tax either more regressive or less regressive, depending upon the amounts expended on such items in relation to income by the various income groups. The exemption of food, we have noted, has mitigated somewhat the regressive character of the sales tax without removing its basic inequities. The reinsertion of food as a taxable item would now have the opposite effect and would virtually restore the full unmitigated, regressive impact of our sales tax. The point is that the imposition of selective sales taxes, whether called excises or otherwise and whether levied at the same rate of the sales tax or at different rates, should be viewed in the same context of moving items in or out of the sales tax bases. As taxes on consumption, they are bad per se. Their effect is to make the sales tax burden more regressive or less regressive, compounded to the extent that their rates may be multiples of the general sales tax rate.

Selective taxes on cigarettes and beer unquestionably would move us in the direction of greater regressiveness.

Let us pursue the example of a 3-cent per pack cigarette tax. Few would contend that wage earners, as an income group, spend less on cigarettes than individuals of higher income or the wealthy. On the contrary, those of higher incomes tend to spend more on the use of other forms of tobaccos, such as cigars, which under the provisions of the cigarette tax bill introduced at the 1957 general session would have escaped a special tax levy. A simple method of determining the effect of a cigarette tax on individuals of different income levels, therefore, would be to compare the amount of revenue that could be raised by such a tax with an equivalent amount raised under our present state personal income tax.

Assuming a 3-cent per pack cigarette tax, a family which smokes two packages a day would be paying \$21.90 a year in taxes. This \$21.90 is the equivalent of the amount that would be derived under our present state personal income tax law from a family of four (man, wife, and two children) with an annual adjusted gross income of

\$6,790.00. A family smoking three packages a day would pay \$32.85 a year, which is the equivalent of the personal income paid by a similar family of four with an adjusted gross income of \$7,885.00 a year. The point is that two families, both smoking two packages of cigarettes a day as in the first example, would be paying the equivalent in state income taxes of a family of four with an adjusted gross income of \$6,790.00, yet their actual gross income may be substantially different. One might be a wage earner family earning \$4,000 a year, while the other might be an executive family earning \$6,790.00 or more. The same reasoning applies to the family using three packs a day. This is the essence of regressive taxation.

It would be wrong, furthermore, to assume that the burden of selective sales taxes will rest on the manufacturers of the items taxed or the consumers of the items as such. Pursuing the example of a cigarette tax still further, it has been established fairly conclusively that cigarette consumption is inelastic pricewise; that is, cigarette consumption does not decline or increase because of an increase or decline in prices within a rather broad range. (What decline in per capita consumption there has taken place in recent years is attributed not to price increases, but to reasons of health and medical research.)

Logically, if these statements are accepted, one cannot avoid the fact that the cigarette tax is, in effect, a tax upon businesses which are not necessarily related to the tobacco industry. Another example will suffice to demonstrate the point.

(1) Mr. Brown, an office worker, smokes two packs of cigarettes, and his wife one pack a day;

(2) Assume California adopts a 3-cent per pack cigarette tax, but the Browns continue to smoke three packages a day;

(3) Assume further, as would be the case, that the cigarette distributors increase the price of cigarettes by the full amount of the tax. The result would be this: The Browns would have \$2.70 less a month to spend on goods that they purchased before the adoption of the tax. They are therefore forced to adjust their consumption pattern in a number of possible directions, as, for example, (a) by cutting back on the purchase of a daily newspaper; (b) fore-

going a movie or two; or (c) perhaps take fewer recreational motor trips or spend less money on so-called fancy foods.

It is apparent that the impact of the tax, apart from the individual, would also be distributed among the producers of the goods and services that the Browns can no longer purchase in the quantities which they formerly purchased. This is to say that the burden of a selective sales tax, on cigarettes, will be determined by the manner in which all the Browns change their consumption patterns. It may fall on business with a high, low, or no profit margin. Under these conditions, any attempt to justify such a tax on the basis of equity of distribution would be futile.

All of these arguments, of course, apply with equal force to many other selective sales taxes, beer being by no means an exception. In a very real sense of the term, beer is a workingman's beverage. It is sufficient to point out that, according to the quantity and cost budgets of the Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics of the University of California, the wage earner family spends five times more per year on beer than the salaried executive's family. In other words, not only would a beer tax increase be regressive as such; it would be actually five times more regressive than a consumer tax on an item which is purchased in essentially equal amounts by the various income groups.

The proponents of selective consumer taxes invariably argue for their imposition on a comparative basis with other states. In the case of the beer tax, it is argued that in California our excise is lower than in most other states. In the same vein, they point out that some 43 states impose a cigarette tax, whereas California allows this lucrative source of revenue to escape an "average" excise. We find it rather revealing that the basis for comparison is always restricted to a specific selective tax in question. They choose to ignore the fact that selective sales taxes are consumption levies, and as such, cannot be compared with any validity whatsoever except as part of the total burden of consumer taxes between states. The choice of the more restrictive framework, of course, is for good reason. It would hardly be persuasive to argue for a selective sales tax by pointing out that the total consumer tax

burden in California is about the highest imposed in any of the large industrial states.

In this connection, we note that Resolution 206 imposes a specific requirement that this committee compare the rate and burden of California taxes with "other large industrial states." Although we have serious and basic reservations concerning such comparisons as a valid basis for the determination of tax policies in California, we nevertheless respectfully urge the committee, in pursuing the "comparison" mandate of the legislature in regard to sales taxes, to steer clear of pseudo comparisons of specific selective sales taxes, and that it make the total impact of taxes on consumption the comparative base.

In view of the committee's directive and our basic reservations about state comparisons, we are refraining from any detailed comment on the matter at this time. We do wish to call to your attention, however, the comparative study made by the national AFL-CIO research department for fiscal year 1956, which was published in the November, 1956 issue of *Labor's Economic Review*, devoted entirely to state and local taxes. Only briefly, we note that the two largest industrial states with which we like to compare ourselves generally, because of our closeness in population, namely, New York and Pennsylvania, each impose a much lighter sales tax burden on its wage earners and residents in general than California.

The AFL-CIO survey, utilizing U. S. Bureau of the Census data for fiscal year 1956, shows revenue amounts in various states derived from various tax sources as a per cent of total revenues. California is shown as deriving 37 per cent of total revenues from the 3 per cent general sales tax, while another 26 per cent is derived from selective sales taxes, i.e. our consumption taxes on motor fuels, liquor, beer, etc. Together they are listed as accounting for 63 per cent of total state revenues, which happens to be the same figure stated earlier as the portion of California General Fund revenues obtained from taxes on consumption. On the other hand, New York, with no general sales tax, derived only 30 per cent of its total revenues from consumer taxes, all through the imposition of selective sales taxes. Pennsylvania, with a 1 per cent general sales tax on tangible personal

property, obtained only 5 per cent of total revenues from this source and another 40 per cent from selective sales taxes for a total of 45 per cent from all taxes on consumption. In other words, for what a comparison of California with these two comparable industrial states may be worth, we are obtaining relatively twice as much of our total revenues from regressive consumer taxes than New York, and relatively 72 per cent more than Pennsylvania.

It might be opportune in this connection to demonstrate by specific example the fallacy of restricting comparisons to selective sales taxes when considering the imposition of such taxes, as for example a cigarette tax. Both New York and Pennsylvania levy a 3-cent and 5-cent per pack tax, respectively, whereas California levies none. In view of the strikingly greater dependence of California on regressive consumer taxes than either of these comparable industrial states, could it seriously be argued that because both New York and Pennsylvania levy a cigarette tax, California should also levy one? We respectfully submit that proponents of the cigarette tax, looking in the direction of selective sales tax levies as a means of closing the General Fund gap, surely must have some other reason for their advocacy of further regressive taxation.

Pursuing the comparative approach with New York and Pennsylvania a bit further, and looking at the other side of the tax fence—the progressive side where a measure of recognition is given to the principle of "ability to pay"—we note in the same AFL-CIO survey a greater dependence in both states on the tax sources of individual and corporate income. In fiscal year 1956, New York obtained 33 per cent of its total revenues on a progressive basis from its personal income tax and another 16 per cent from its corporate net income tax, as compared with California's 8 per cent from the personal income tax and 10 per cent from our franchise and corporate income taxes, respectively. Although Pennsylvania levies no personal income tax as such, it obtains a larger percentage of its total revenues from corporate net income than California does from both the personal income and franchise and corporate income taxes combined.

Again, however, we assert our reservations regarding comparative findings. We frankly submit that the major task of the committee is to look inward for

its guideposts; inward **first** within the state to the needs of California's growing number of residents for state expenditures, not only in the immediate future but over the next several fiscal years; and inward **second** within the intellect and conscience of the committee for the development of tax criteria to be employed in the recommendation of a tax structure that will supply the revenues necessary to meet the projected expenditure needs.

In regard to the former—the determination of expenditure needs—we strongly urge the committee to take in account not only considerations of growth in providing for the expansion of state institutions and established programs, or in meeting the expanding needs of education and social welfare, but also the considerations of growth itself—to provide for and facilitate the process of growth in the planning and development of growth resources, particularly water and power, and the necessary establishment of a planning agency for growth, both physical and economic. We submit that the narrower budgetary concepts and approach of a Ways and Means Committee, devoted as it should be to “pruning the fat” out of a particular budget and passing upon specified appropriations, has no place before this interim study committee. The responsibility of the committee in projecting expenditures, we believe, is to apply, exclusively, need concepts of varying priority and acceptability, and to correspondingly project varying levels of general expenditure budgets for tax determination purposes. Within this framework, the value of the committee's hard work would be critically lessened if it did not consider expenditures in the broader context of needs for growth itself as well as in the narrower, residual concept of growth.

Turning now to the tax side of what we believe to be the committee's major task—the development of tax criteria for employment in making recommendations—first consideration, in our opinion, must go to the question of what is equitable and fair in taxation. As stated at the outset, we have full confidence in the committee, in pursuing long-overdue studies required by Resolution 206 to determine the impact of taxes among taxpayers and income groups and to identify incidences of preferential treatment. Findings of facts from studies, however, no matter how exhaustively or scrupulously undertaken,

do fall into place automatically as recommendations for action. Facts facilitate, but cannot make “value judgments.” Obviously, such judgments are as necessary in the employment of facts as they are the inescapable function of the committee to make them. We do not believe that the committee can escape a positive declaration of what it considers to be a fair and equitable basis for taxation. In this connection, we ask specifically whether the committee accepts the concept of “ability to pay” as a valid basis for taxation, or whether it believes that the effective rate of taxation should either be proportional up and down the income ladder, or greater for lower income groups than the upper income groups. It is our considered opinion that a decision on this basic issue is not only necessary, but would greatly facilitate and ease the burden of the committee.

I don't believe there is any doubt where organized labor stands on the question. We sincerely believe in the principle of “ability to pay,” and consider it our obligation, in a public forum such as this committee hearing, to advocate it as forcefully as we possibly can. Further, should the committee find itself of the same belief, we are of the opinion that there would be little room for speculation about the direction in which the committee should eventually be moving after its findings of fact become available. If these findings of fact, moreover, substantiate our essential position regarding the regressive impact of our dominant form of taxation in California—and we believe they will—then, by the same token, we believe the committee should do more than just reject the imposition of additional consumer taxes as a means of bridging the present and projected budgetary gaps. In this event, we believe that a further obligation would exist to recommend provision for needed revenues, immediate and projected, through a far-reaching upward revision of the California tax structure as a whole more in accord with the “ability to pay” principle.

While we hesitate to spell out specifically the manner in which this should be done before all the facts are in, we would in general look toward the removal or the reduction of taxes on consumption to the maximum extent feasible at this stage of our gross overdependence on this source of revenue, and simultaneous establishment of a far greater dependence on individual and

corporate income as a progressive source of revenue.

We recognize, of course, that if the sales tax were removed, any upward revision of the personal income tax would have to be along lines that would apply a good progressive range of rates to smaller taxable income steps than is presently the case, so as to reach on an "ability to pay" basis, more individuals and families in the lower-and lower-middle-income ranges where the great bulk of personal income is found. Although these individuals and families by and large do not pay any state income tax at present, they are the ones bearing the greatest regressive burden of consumer taxes. Thus, unless the sales tax is removed, we would be vigorously opposed to any effort to amend the present income tax law to reach lower down the income scale for additional revenue, as for example, by reducing exemptions. In these lower ranges, it would be piling abuse upon abuse to force the payment of income taxes on top of back-breaking sales tax levies, even if the addition of an income tax burden were considered a principled "ability to pay" abuse.

We also believe that substantially increased amounts of revenues could be obtained from corporate net income in the state without adversely affecting either presently located businesses or the prospects of needed industrial expansion, inasmuch as state corporate taxes are also deductible under federal corporate filings. Irrespective of whether additional corporate levies are recommended, we firmly believe that progressive, "ability to pay" tax rates have a place in a corporate tax structure as in an individual income structure. Our present franchise and corporation tax laws apply flat rates without regard to corporate size. We urge the application of progressive rates so that the competitive disadvantages of small business concerns may be at least partially offset, and small business thereby encouraged.

Additionally, as a source of virtually untapped revenue, we point to the field of inheritance and gift taxation. The full tax credit allowed under the federal estate tax law should be viewed not as a limit on our state inheritance levy, but as an added incentive for the realization of the full potential of this revenue source.

In concluding, we refer finally to the necessity that taxes levied be consistent with the orderly development and ex-

pansion of our state economy. Our virtual silence on this point thus far relative to what may appear to be a preoccupation with tax impact, is certainly not to be construed as a denial of its importance. On the contrary, our opposition to taxes on consumption stems as much from their generally adverse impact on the economy as from their unfair impact on individuals.

It has been sincerely argued by some proponents of sales taxes that they are an important "built-in," anti-inflation weapon in that they take money out of the consumption stream at a specified rate in direct proportion to the price spiral of an inflation. This may have some validity when inflation stems from goods in short supply, as during a war. Outside of emergency-created actual shortages, the argument is just so much nonsense. Indeed, during periods of normalcy, the adverse effect of sales taxes on consumer purchasing power far offsets any favorable contribution that may accidentally be derived in other directions.

The primary economic problem facing the state and nation in the current long-run period of rapidly expanding productive ability, entering, as we are, the threshold of automation, is the problem of maintaining consumer purchasing power at a level sufficiently high to buy the ever increasing product of industry. Who will deny that this is not the basic problem in our current, serious recession?

In allowing savings to escape taxation completely, sales taxes thrust their entire burden onto consumer purchasing power, where it can be borne least successfully without causing cyclical ups and downs and hurting the economy. Sales taxes are actually and more consistently built-in disincentives to economic expansion, because the basic determinant of plant and equipment outlays for additional capacity is the continuing ability of consumer buying power to take up existing product market supplies and to absorb additions to those supplies. What favorable effects the preferential treatment of saving by sales taxes have on investments are more than offset by the direct, full impact of sales taxes on the buying side. The fact is that, historically, investments in plant and equipment have always been forthcoming when buying power has been present to take up the additional product. If the buying power is not there, and the preferential sales tax treatment

of savings actually promotes plant and equipment expenditures to increase capacity, then, indeed, the sales tax is doubly bad—bad for the economy at both the consumption and savings-investment ends.

This same reasoning applies with equal force to the pet devices advocated by business groups and the wealthy for softening the burden of taxation on dividend and other so-called potential investment income, and for allowing the rapid write-off of plant and equipment, etc.—all in the name of helping the economy. Likewise, if it was these types of tax programs, enacted at the federal level in 1954, which encouraged the unhealthy boom in plant and equipment expenditures starting in 1955, that in turn caused the unsustainable imbalance between capital expenditures and consumer purchasing power in the precipitation of the current recession, we have indeed all the more reason to steer clear of tax measures that proclaim the good of the economy and everyone on the basis of what is good for "General Motors," or more generally, the privileged and the wealthy.

We believe that "trickle-down" tax theories and practices have been tried enough in our economy. We think it is time now to turn toward a broader base and broader concepts of fair and equitable taxation for the benefit of the many by benefiting the economy generally.

IV

POLITICAL ACTIVITY

The tremendous victory achieved in the Federation's campaign to defeat Proposition 18, the "right to work" proposal, at the November 4, 1958, election nearly outshines our great successes in electing candidates endorsed by the California Labor League for Political Education. Our emphasis on Proposition 18 throughout the past year is, however, not only understandable, since adoption of this measure would have had disastrous consequences for the California labor movement, but our no let-up fight against Proposition 18 worked simultaneously to the advantage of CLLPE-supported candidates who backed our stand against the "right to work" initiative.

This year's elections saw more intense and effective activity and wider participation by organized labor—local unions, councils and the membership—than in

any election ever held in California. Because of the importance of the basic issues involved in every phase of these elections, your secretary will report separately on the various outstanding items.

Election Campaigns

Meeting in a pre-primary election convention on April 14, and, following the primary on June 3, in a pre-general election convention on August 27, the CLLPE endorsed candidates for statewide office, as well as for Congress, the State Senate and Assembly, and the State Board of Equalization.

Election Pamphlets

After each convention, the CLLPE endorsements were printed in election pamphlets for the use of our affiliated organizations. A general pamphlet, which contained the names of all endorsed candidates in the state, was issued, and eight district pamphlets, listing statewide candidates and the candidates for Congress, State Assembly and Senate, and Board of Equalization in the particular district involved. These district pamphlets were prepared for Alameda County, Los Angeles County, Sacramento Valley Area, San Diego County, San Francisco, San Joaquin Valley, San Mateo County, Solano and Contra Costa Counties. The pamphlets for the November 4 election also contained the YES or NO vote recommended by the California State Federation of Labor on each of the ballot propositions.

Registration and "Get-Out-the-Vote"

Our election campaigns were marked by more forceful and persistent efforts than were ever put forth before, first, to get our entire membership registered to vote, and second, to make sure that the members went to the polls and cast their ballots on election day. Certainly, the largest possible vote by labor was of paramount importance in our fight to defeat Proposition 18.

For the June 3 primary election, the closing date for registration was April 10; for the general election on November 4, September 11. This information reached our members through frequent letters from your secretary to the local unions and councils and repeated articles in both the State Federation and CLLPE weekly newsletters; in addition, leaflets were sent to all local unions and councils, outlining five suggested plans for the registration of union members. A month before the September 11 registration deadline for the

November election, large posters pointing out the need for registration were sent to all our councils for placement in council headquarters, along with the following pertinent information:

To vote in the November 4 election, the following must register:

(1) Anyone who did not vote in November, 1956, and who has not since registered;

(2) Anyone who has moved since the primary election in June of this year;

(3) Anyone whose name has been changed through marriage or court action;

(4) Anyone who will be 21 by November 4, 1958, the date of the general election.

New California residents who have lived within the state for a year are eligible for registration.

It is interesting to note that what we learned from the registration programs undertaken by our local organizations confirmed our long standing belief that staggering numbers of otherwise qualified trade union members were not registered to vote. By midsummer, the important achievement of our registration drives to date at the local level was the determination of who the unregistered members were through the slow process of checking the names of trade union members against the registration rolls. After this had been completed, the terrific job of registering these members began.

We did well, as may be judged by a glance at the unprecedentedly high number of voters who went to the polls throughout the state at each election, but this effort, while sufficient to make us victorious over Proposition 18 and elect a gratifyingly large number of our endorsed candidates, should be considered as only the start of a continuing campaign to make our entire membership eligible to vote at every election from now on.

As soon as the September 11 registration deadline had passed, your secretary urged our affiliates to step up their "get out the vote" campaigns. Copies of suggested "get out the vote" techniques prepared by the National Committee on Political Education were mailed to all unions and councils. Great praise is due our councils for the excellent work they did in complying with these vitally necessary directives and suggestions. Commendation of the labor press is also in order for the publicizing of our appeals for action throughout the state.

State Republican and Democratic Conventions

The state conventions of the Republican and Democratic parties were held one week apart at the beginning of August. Platform proposals of the California State Federation of Labor were submitted by us to each convention. The subjects covered by these proposals were labor legislation, farm labor, unemployment compensation and unemployment disability insurance, workmen's compensation, taxation, civil rights, and water and power.

Briefly, our proposals called for the following:

Under **Labor Legislation**, we approved (1) any extremist legislation which, directly or indirectly, would undermine the democratic framework evolved for the peaceful solution of labor management problems; specifically, we opposed so-called "right to work" legislation, which would accomplish this purpose by denying a majority union the security it must have to engage in constructive relationships with employers; (2) any punitive legislation which, within the legal framework of our system of industrial relations, would so restrict the area of voluntary action as to destroy equality in bargaining; we therefore opposed measures which would restrict the right to strike, or the right to picket, or the right of workmen to assist each other through secondary actions, such as the secondary boycott and consumer boycotts; and (3) we urged immediate repeal of California's so-called jurisdictional strike act, which has proved a potent weapon in the hands of anti-labor elements intent on destroying bona fide labor unions through the promotion of company unions.

On the positive side, we supported (1) enactment of state legislation declaring the right of public employees to join bona fide unions, and to engage in free collective bargaining; (2) a state fair labor standards act, comparable to the federal law which would establish a statutory minimum wage of \$1.25, applicable to men as well as women and minors; and (3) enactment of legislation which will assure workers in intra-state commerce the protection of law in the exercise of their right to organize for the purpose of collective bargaining and other mutual aid.

For **Farm Labor**, we urged (1) extension to the agricultural worker of all national and state social and economic legislation that has been enacted in the last two decades, and which has been arbi-

trarily denied to this essential segment of our labor force and economy; (2) opposition to the importation of foreign labor unless the need has been demonstrated conclusively, and then only at wages and under working conditions which will protect alien nationals as well as prevent the further undermining of domestic labor standards; and (3) support of legislation that will assure migrant workers adequate housing, educational, health, hospital and recreational facilities.

Our program for **Unemployment Compensation and Unemployment Disability Insurance** called for amendment of the California laws to provide that (1) an individual's primary benefit shall not be less than 65 per cent of his weekly wage; (2) weekly benefits shall be payable for a maximum period of 39 weeks; (3) the maximum weekly benefit amount shall be at least two-thirds of average weekly wages of covered workers; (4) full coverage shall be extended to all wage and salary workers presently denied protection, including agricultural and domestic workers, and employees of non-profit organizations and city, county and state government; and (5) retroactive payments of benefits shall be made for the present one-week waiting period to those workers who are unemployed or disabled more than one week.

In the field of **Workmen's Compensation**, we urged the following changes in the California law: (1) the maximum weekly benefit amount of both temporary and permanent disabilities should be increased to a level that assures the average worker who suffers an industrial injury that he will receive a benefit which conforms to the wage loss compensation standard prescribed in the law itself; namely, 65 per cent of his average weekly wages; (2) provision should be made for retroactive payment of benefits during the waiting period for all disabilities lasting more than one week; (3) mandatory coverage should be extended to employment in agriculture and domestic service; (4) the present arbitrary limitations on the duration of death benefit payments should be removed so as to continue payments to a dependent spouse until death or remarriage, with additional benefits for dependents; and (5) the law should be amended to provide a program for the rehabilitation of injured workers unable to return to their former employment, with provision for full payment of disability benefits now provided by law.

Under **Taxation**, we spoke out strongly against the imposition of more consumer taxes to meet the deficit to be faced by

the legislature at the 1959 session, and stated our position that new revenues should be obtained by upward revision of the California tax structure in line with the principle of ability to pay; within such a revision, we held, the sales tax should be either completely removed or drastically reduced. As an additional source of revenue, we asked that consideration be given to (1) the upward revision of severance taxes, so that persons profiting from the extraction of irreplaceable natural resources (such as oil) would bear a fair share of the state's tax burden, and (2) an increase in inheritance taxes on the transfer of wealth from one generation to the next.

On the subject of **Civil Rights**, we asked for state legislative action to correct abuses in the two major areas of employment and housing; a fair employment practices act, and legislation to end segregated housing by prohibiting racial discrimination in all state, federal and local housing programs.

Finally, in regard to **Water and Power**, we reaffirmed our undeviating support of the federal reclamation laws, and of the comprehensive, integrated development of the Central Valley Project according to the Bureau of Reclamation's plan. Thus, in the entrance of the state in the field of water and power development, we stated our insistence upon the prior adoption of policies, patterned after federal reclamation law, which assure the widest possible distribution of the benefits of state expenditures for water power development; and further, that state projects must have proven economic and financial feasibility, and that such projects shall **supplement** federal construction, rather than **supplant** it, so that the maximum amount of funds available for water and power development may be put to work in a real "partnership" for the people.

The Republican convention, held the weekend of August 2-3, took a neutral position on the "right to work" Proposition 18, and refused adamantly to take any position at all on either the labor-backed tax revision Proposition 17 or on fair employment practices. The Knowland-Chandler machine was in complete control of the convention apparatus, and those who attempted to obtain a reaffirmation of the pro-union shop plank of the 1956 Republican platform were overwhelmingly defeated.

A week later, the California Democratic convention adopted a strong labor platform, condemning Proposition 18 and de-

claring Democratic support of the following:

(1) State full employment legislation and economic policies geared at keeping wages and purchasing power of consumers abreast of our productive ability.

(2) Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and re-enactment of a fair labor-management relations act along lines of the Wagner Act; opposition to giving states jurisdiction over labor-relations matters affecting interstate commerce; absolute opposition to any infringement of labor's right to engage in peaceful picketing that is an exercise of free speech; repeal of the state so-called jurisdictional strike law; restrict issuance of anti-labor injunctions and uphold labor's right to secondary actions.

(3) Enactment of a state fair labor standards act with a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour for men as well as women and minors.

(4) Extension of all socio-economic legislation, including minimum wage protection and right to organize, to agricultural workers; halt exploitation of imported Mexican farm workers.

(5) Complete liberalization of unemployment insurance and unemployment disability insurance programs, including at least a \$60 maximum weekly benefit, removal of unfair restrictions, and extension of coverage.

(6) Far-reaching liberalization of workmen's compensation to accomplish its purpose, including a \$70 maximum weekly benefit, removal of artificial ceilings on death benefits payments duration, enactment of rehabilitation program and expanded coverage.

The Democrats also adopted liberal positions in support of FEPC and other civil rights, housing, and health and welfare issues.

In the field of taxation, however, the Democrats refused to declare that they were against levying additional consumer taxes to make up the \$250 million deficit facing the state next year, and specifically rejected Proposition 17. They also failed to adopt, although the vote was close, the basic principles of the Federation's proposed plank on water and power.

Election Results

Looking back now, we can see that the results of the primary election on June 3 furnished a true forecast of our victories in November. Fortunately, its principal effect on us was to spur us on to even

greater efforts than had gone into the primary campaign.

The official results of the November 4 general election are not yet available at this writing, but, with a few exceptions, unofficial returns have definitely decided the victory or defeat of candidates and ballot propositions. Official figures, and the counting of absentee ballots, will alter the various totals but will not change the result, except in those few cases where the issue will be decided by the absentee ballots.

Our proudest achievement was, of course, the defeat of Proposition 18 by close to a million votes.

In summary, at this writing (with some totals to be changed by the absentee ballot tallies):

(1) State AFL-endorsed candidates swept to victory in virtually all state offices and also took a majority of Congressional, State Senate and State Assembly seats.

(2) More than 70 per cent of AFL-backed candidates won federal and state office.

(3) Attorney General Brown, AFL-backed candidate for Governor, headed the list of five AFL candidates who took all but two of the seven statewide races. In the U. S. Senatorial contest, the AFL had endorsed both Clair Engle and Goodwin Knight.

(4) The race for Secretary of State remains in doubt, with AFL-backed Henry P. Lopez trailing incumbent Frank Jordan by a small margin. Absentee votes will decide this contest.

(5) Sixteen out of 30 AFL-endorsed candidates won in 30 Congressional races.

(6) Fifteen out of 18 endorsed candidates were successful in the 20 State Senate races.

(7) Fifty-one out of 75 endorsed candidates won in the races for 80 State Assembly seats.

(8) Three of the four AFL candidates won in the races for State Board of Equalization posts.

CLLPE-Endorsed Candidates Elected

General Election, November 4, 1958

Governor

Edmund G. Brown (D)

Lieutenant Governor

Glenn M. Anderson (D)

U. S. Senator

Clair Engle (D)

Attorney General

Judge Stanley Mosk (D)

State Controller

Alan Cranston (D)

United States Congress*District*

1. Clement W. Miller (D)
2. Harold T. (Bizz) Johnson (D)
3. John E. Moss, Jr. (D)
5. John F. Shelley (D)
7. Jeffery Cohelan (D)
8. George P. Miller (D)
11. John J. McFall (D)
12. B. F. Sisk (D)
14. Harlan Hagen (D)
17. Cecil R. King (D)
19. Chet Holifield (D)
23. Clyde Doyle (D)
25. George Kasem (D)
26. James Roosevelt (D)
27. Harry R. Sheppard (D)
29. D. S. (Judge) Saund (D)

State Senate

2. Randolph Collier (R)
4. Waverly Jack Slattery (D)
8. Virgil O'Sullivan (D)
10. Ed C. Johnson (R)
12. Joseph A. Rattigan (D)
14. J. Eugene McAteer (D)
16. John W. Holmdahl (D)
20. Alan Short (D)
22. Hugh P. Donnelly (D)
24. James A. Cobey (D)
26. Stephen P. Teale (D)
30. Hugh Burns (D)
34. Walter W. Stiern (D)
36. Stanford C. Shaw (D)
38. Richard Richards (D)

State Assembly

2. Pauline L. Davis (D)
3. Lloyd W. Lowrey (D)
5. Samuel R. Geddes (D)
6. Paul J. Lunardi (D)
7. Richard H. McCollister (R)
8. Thomas J. MacBride (D)
9. Edwin Z'berg (D)
10. Jerome Waldie (D)
11. S. C. Masterson (D)
12. William Biddick, Jr. (D)
13. Carlos Bee (D)
14. Robert W. Crown (D)
15. Nicholas Petris (D)
17. William B. Rumford (D)
19. Charles W. Meyers (D)
20. A. Phillip Burton (D)
23. John A. O'Connell (D)
24. Edward M. Gaffney (D)
26. Carl A. Britschgi (R)

District

27. Glenn E. Coolidge (R)
29. Bruce F. Allen (R)
30. Ralph M. Brown (D)
31. Gordon H. Winton, Jr. (D)
32. Bert De Lotto (D)
33. Charles B. Garrigus (D)
34. Alan G. Pattee (R)
35. Myron H. Frew (D)
36. James L. Holmes (R)
37. Rex M. Cunningham (D)
38. Dorothy Donahoe (D)
39. John Williamson (D)
40. Edward E. Elliott (D)
41. Allen Miller (D)
42. Tom Bane (D)
44. Joseph M. Kennick (D)
45. George E. Brown, Jr. (D)
50. Ronald B. Cameron (D)
51. William A. Munnell (D)
52. George Willson (D)
55. Vernon Kilpatrick (D)
59. Thomas M. Rees (D)
61. Lester A. McMillan (D)
62. Augustus F. Hawkins (D)
63. Don A. Allen, Sr. (D)
65. Jesse M. Unruh (D)
66. Charles H. Wilson (D)
67. Clayton A. Dills (D)
68. Vincent Thomas (D)
69. Carley V. Porter (D)
72. Eugene G. Nisbet (D)
75. Richard T. Hanna (D)
76. Leverette D. House (D)
80. Jim Bear (D)

Board of Equalization

1. George R. Reilly (D)
3. Paul Leake (D)
4. Richard Nevins (D)

Ballot Propositions

- No. 1 \$300 Million State Bonds for Veterans' Loans.
Recommendation: YES.
Vote: YES.
- No. 2 \$220 Million State Bonds for Schoolhouse Construction.
Recommendation: YES.
Vote: YES.
- No. 3 \$200 Million Bonds for State Construction.
Recommendation: YES.
Vote: YES.
- No. 4 \$50 Million State Harbor Bonds.
Recommendation: YES.
Vote: YES.

- No. 5 Salaries of Members of the Legislature.
Recommendation: YES.
Vote: NO.
- No. 6 Advertising of State Bonds.
Recommendation: YES.
Vote: NO.
- No. 7 Succession to Legislative Offices and Office of Governor in Event of Military Disaster.
Recommendation: YES.
Vote: YES.
- No. 8 Eligibility to Vote in Presidential Election.
Recommendation: YES.
Vote: YES.
- No. 9 Length of General Sessions of the Legislature.
Recommendation: YES.
Vote: YES.
- No. 10 Eminent Domain Proceedings.
Recommendation: NONE.
Vote: NO.
- No. 11 Street and Road Bonds by Cities, Counties and Separation of Grade Districts.
Recommendation: NO.
Vote: NO.
- No. 12 Legislator as Notary.
Recommendation: YES.
Vote: NO.
- No. 13 Appointive Superintendent of Public Instruction.
Recommendation: NO.
Vote: NO.
- No. 14 Compensation of County Officials.
Recommendation: YES.
Vote: NO.
- No. 15 Boxing and Wrestling on Sundays and Memorial Day.
Recommendation: YES.
Vote: NO.
- No. 16 Taxation of School Property of Religious and Other Non-Profit Organizations.
Recommendation: NO.
Vote: NO.
- No. 17 State Sales and Income Tax Revision.
Recommendation: YES.
Vote: NO.
- No. 18 Compulsory Open Shop Initiative ("Right to Work" Fraud).
Recommendation: NO.
Vote: NO.

DEFEAT OF "RIGHT TO WORK"

The overwhelming defeat of the "right to work" initiative constitutional amendment, Proposition 18, at the November 4, 1958 general election brought to an end a bitter and unscrupulously fought two-year campaign by the open shop forces to cripple and, they hoped, eventually destroy the organized labor movement in California.

The verdict of the California voters was decisive, but it would be extremely dangerous to believe that the emphatic rejection of the compulsory open shop at this election has ended the matter once and for all. Organized labor in the State of Washington soundly defeated a "right to work" measure in 1956, and then had to defeat it all over again in this year's election, only two years later. And in California, the attempts to enact "right to work" began in 1944, and labor has been combatting it in one form or another during most of the last fourteen years.

We have learned a great deal from the just-concluded campaign—about our adversaries and their methods, about our own ability to wage the kind of campaign needed, about our friends outside the labor movement. But it must not be overlooked that the open-shoppers have also learned a great deal, nor can we forget for a moment that they are not only fanatical open-shoppers, but they are also well-heeled.

Their national support was evident throughout the campaign, and less than a week after their "right to work" proposals had been beaten in five out of six states, winning only in non-industrial Kansas, the National Right-to-Work Committee was announcing that they were "far from licked" and had only "begun to fight."

Because of the long history of labor's successful thwarting of the plans of the "right to work" advocates in California, and because a renewal of their efforts has already been threatened, your secretary believes that an account of the events of the past two years should be set down here as part of the permanent record of the California State Federation of Labor's activity on behalf of the organized workers of our state, and as a guide in any future eventuality for ourselves as well as the labor movements in other states.

Background, 1944-1956

In 1944, Arkansas, Florida and California were picked as their first targets

by the proponents of the open shop. In the first two of these states, the constitutional amendments embodying the measure were adopted. In California, where our State Federation of Labor sparked, organized and led the opposition, the initiative constitutional amendment entitled "Right of Employment" (Proposition 12) was defeated by nearly 600,000 votes.

In the spring of 1946, a second attempt was made by the backers of Proposition 12 to use the initiative process to secure the enactment of the measure by a vote of the electorate. Two petitions were circulated, their real purpose clumsily disguised as "veterans' employment" and "regulation of unions," but both failed to obtain a sufficient number of signatures. Thereafter, the use of the initiative was abandoned for nearly twelve years, while the open shop advocates made strenuous efforts to force their measure through the legislature.

Beginning with the 1947 general session of the California legislature and continuing through the 1953 session, out-and-out "right to work" or open shop bills were regularly introduced, and just as regularly were either killed or permitted to die in committee, thanks to the alertness of labor's legislative representatives in Sacramento and their soundly reasoned arguments against the proposals. In 1955 an attempt was made on the floor of the Assembly to amend a mild fair employment practices bill into a compulsory open shop measure, but this was easily defeated by a vote of 45 to 15. Many skeleton bills had been introduced at that session which could have been amended into full blown "right to work" bills. These were closely watched by the Federation's representatives, but nothing came of them. Again in the last session, 1957, no "right to work" bills were introduced. One bill, however, whose ultimate purpose was to undermine unions and render them ineffective, while appearing to recognize their right to exist, was strongly supported by "right to work" advocates. They managed to get this bill out of committee, but it was killed on the Senate floor when stricken from the floor by a voice vote.

In the meantime, the "right to work" drives continued in other states, and often were successful. The banner year was 1947; over half of the nineteen states that now have these laws enacted them in that year.

Recognizing how serious the situation had become, although it was not yet a menace in California, our State Federa-

tion of Labor's 1954 convention passed and sent to the AF of L convention for further action **Resolution No. 121**—"Campaign to Repeal 'Right to Work' Legislation and Prevent Further Enactment." This resolution called for a powerful counter-attack by organized labor. It is significant of the temper of the American labor movement at that time that our resolution was joined at the AF of L convention by six others, substantially the same as ours, and became part of the substitute resolution combining the best features of all, which was adopted. The following year, our California convention again spoke out against "right to work," condemning the open shop campaigns of the National Association of Manufacturers and the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, and warning against the introduction of such proposals in the California legislature.

Our 1956 convention adopted **Resolution No. 168** — "Combat So-Called 'Right to Work' Bills." Reflecting the worsening situation, this resolution went further than any of its predecessors in assessing the danger and spelling out a program. We declared our opposition to "right to work" legislation, whether it be on the federal, state or local level, and assumed the responsibility of acquainting the people of California with the true nature and purposes of such laws. Every delegate to the convention was pledged to explain the issues to organizations, as well as to the press, in his local community. Central bodies were asked to make this program one of their major activities and to require reports on developments from their delegates.

Immediately after convention adjournment, copies of the resolution went out from the office of the Federation, not only to all central labor councils in the state, but also to any organization which might be expected either to oppose or endorse such legislation, and the Federation prepared itself as much as possible in advance to meet the start of this anti-union campaign. We had not long to wait.

"Right to Work" Ordinances, 1956-1958

Palm Springs

After a long hard fight, the Culinary Workers and Bartenders' organizing campaign in Palm Springs had at last begun to show real progress in the late summer of 1956. To halt this, the Palm Springs Employers' Association launched a counter-offensive, proposing the enactment by the city council of a "right to work" ordinance. Labor rallied at once, and dozens

of union officials and members were present when the city council met toward the end of October, 1956, for a hearing on the proposed ordinance.

President Pitts represented the State Federation at this meeting. In addition, there were numerous citizens and representatives of other groups present to speak against the ordinance. Before many of the opponents of the measure had an opportunity to present their views, however, debate was suddenly cut off by a motion to table the ordinance.

This undemocratic action was strongly protested, even by those who believed that the tabling motion meant that the issue was dead. The maneuver became plain, however, when at a meeting on November 14, 1956, the city council adopted the ordinance by a vote of six to one, despite the substantial opposition to it, and despite the opinion of the League of California Cities, whose advice had been requested by the city council, that such an ordinance would be "an unconstitutional invasion of the State's legislative domain."

At the December, 1956, meeting of the State Federation's executive council, detailed reports on this matter were presented by members of the labor-formed Riverside County Ordinance Committee. Following this, the council unanimously adopted a resolution which (1) condemned the "right to work" ordinance as an unwarranted interference by local government in labor-management relations; (2) committed the total resources of the State Federation and its affiliates to the abolition of the ordinance; (3) sponsored a fund-raising campaign to finance labor's legal challenge to the measure. The resolution was as follows.

Whereas, The City of Palm Springs has adopted a misnamed "right to work" ordinance; and

Whereas, This ordinance is punitive in character, being directed at recent union organizing efforts in the hotel and restaurant industry; and

Whereas, The responsible employers of Palm Springs opposed this ordinance; and

Whereas, The ordinance will disrupt the peaceful relations now prevailing between most employers and unions in the area; and

Whereas, Local government interference with a collective bargaining relationship will mean low wages and inferior working conditions; and

Whereas, The ordinance will inevitably result in decreased consumer purchasing power to the detriment of the business community; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Executive Council of the California State Federation of Labor does condemn the ordinance as an unwarranted interference in labor-management relations; and be it further

Resolved, That the Executive Council does hereby pledge the full resources of the California State Federation of Labor to achieve abolition of this destructive ordinance.

Two suits challenging the ordinance were immediately filed through the Riverside County Ordinance Committee, representing organized labor in the area, one by Culinary Workers and Bartenders No. 535, San Bernardino, the other by Electrical Workers No. 440, Riverside, and in February organized labor won a preliminary victory.

Sitting in Indio, Riverside County, Superior Judge Hilton McCabe issued, on January 31, 1957, a ten-page opinion in which he reaffirmed the long held legal position that local communities have no right to enact "right to work" legislation. Pointing out that in California, union or closed shop agreements are lawful, his opinion refused to concede the City of Palm Springs the right to enact a "right to work" law and thereby "attempt to prevent that which the federal and state law says is lawful." The City of Palm Springs was enjoined against enforcing the ordinance. The Palm Springs city council promptly appealed this decision.

During the year that elapsed between Judge McCabe's decision and that of the Appellate Court, the Riverside County Ordinance Committee remained active. At a statewide gathering of labor representatives held in Palm Springs in June 1957, the case was thoroughly discussed, with due emphasis upon its relation to what already appeared to be a statewide ordinance campaign by the "right to work" forces.

The Fourth District Court of Appeals handed down its long-awaited decision on the Palm Springs ordinance case about the middle of January, 1958, upholding Judge McCabe's ruling that the ordinance was unconstitutional. The Palm Springs city council then petitioned the California Supreme Court for a hearing. On March 13, 1958, this court agreed to review the lower court decisions.

Later, as will be seen, the Palm Springs case was scheduled for a hearing by the

State Supreme Court together with the Trinity County ordinance case, and still later, with the San Benito case.

Tehama County

The "right to work" advocates struck for the second time in the northern part of the state, five months after the passage of the Palm Springs ordinance. On April 22, 1957, by a vote of three to two, the board of supervisors of Tehama County adopted an ordinance outlawing the union shop and restricting the right to strike. This action followed the pattern of Palm Springs in that the ordinance was enacted to halt the successful organizing campaign of the Five Counties Central Labor Council. Actively supporting the ordinance were a so-called Citizens Committee for Voluntary Unionism and the notorious California Association of Employers. The northern location of this second ordinance also indicated to labor observers the probability that a network of such ordinances might be spread throughout the state, to be followed by an all-out drive for a state "right to work" law. Subsequent events were to prove this surmise correct.

Court action was immediately taken to nullify the Tehama County ordinance. The State Federation pledged all possible legal assistance, and Federation officers—President Pitts and Vice Presidents Harry Finks, Robert Giesick and Lowell Nelson—worked closely with local, state and international labor officials.

On June 2, 1957, Superior Court Judge Curtis E. Wetter held that the county ordinance could not be applied in the city of Red Bluff or in any city within the county, as sought by local employers. Although Judge Wetter's ruling did not touch either the validity of the ordinance on a county basis or its constitutionality, no attempt has been made to date to apply it in county territory or to appeal the decision.

As we go to press, the imminent repeal of this ordinance has been announced. Meeting shortly after the decisive defeat of Proposition 18, the board of supervisors of Tehama County voted unanimously to repeal the "right to work" ordinance, and instructed its county attorney to prepare the necessary repealer.

San Benito County

Two days after the decision was handed down in the Tehama County case, "right to work" appeared in the central part of the state. On July 4, 1957, the San Benito County board of supervisors adopted an identical ordinance, four of the members

voting in favor, the fifth abstaining. Spokesmen for organized labor opposed the ordinance at the hearing, while representatives of the local chamber of commerce, the California Farm Bureau Federation and a local employers' association urged its adoption. The State Federation immediately announced that it would enter the legal fight against the measure.

On July 5, only 48 hours after the ordinance had gone into effect, Superior Court Judge Stanley Lawson of Monterey County, sitting in Hollister, refused to grant an injunction under its provisions. In a written opinion issued on July 31, 1957, Judge Lawson declared the ordinance invalid, and made the following important points:

(1) A local statute that conflicts with an Act of Congress is void.

(2) The union shop is permitted by federal legislation except where a state or territory prohibits it. The expression "state or territorial law" does not include the political subdivision thereof; therefore, "the permission granted to the state (to enact such a law) has not been extended to its political subdivisions."

(3) The State of California has legislated on the subject of union security and in so doing has held the closed shop as well as the union shop lawful.

(4) A county may not pass an ordinance which conflicts with the general laws of the state or the United States; nor may it forbid what the state law allows, or legislate when the state law occupies that field.

These points seem to form the legal basis for denying the validity of any county ordinance. More than a year was to elapse, however, before Judge Lawson's decision met a higher court test. In the meantime, the open shop ordinance drive continued.

Yuba and Lake Counties

All during the spring of 1957, the Citizens Committee for Voluntary Unionism and the California Association of Employers had kept pressuring the boards of supervisors of Yuba, Lake and Sutter Counties to enact "right to work" ordinances. Labor observers reported that these anti-labor organizations functioned smoothly and seemed to be part of a centrally directed, well-coordinated effort. Labor union resistance, however, was also well-directed and coordinated. State Federation vice presidents in northern California worked with countywide union committees in a far-reaching and effective educational campaign that reached the ma-

jority of the people in the various counties. Purchased newspaper advertising was used, and statements by well-known and responsible local citizens were released for publication. Voters were circularized by mail with material exposing the pitfalls of "right to work" philosophy as set forth in the proposed ordinances.

The results were gratifying. People who had known little or nothing of the labor movement before our campaign began not only attended the hearings, but spoke convincingly on labor's side against the ordinances.

At a preliminary hearing on July 1, 1957, the Yuba County board of supervisors voted to postpone action on the ordinance. A week later, on July 8, the board of supervisors of Lake County voted to take the ordinance under advisement.

To date, no further action has been taken in either of these counties.

Sutter County

The Sutter County board of supervisors also held a preliminary hearing on the ordinance on July 1, 1957, and, like Yuba County, voted to postpone action. The issue was revived again in October, however, and on November 4, 1957, by a vote of three to two, a "right to work" ordinance was adopted. The Sutter County ordinance is a duplicate of Tehama County's. No attempt has been made to enforce this ordinance.

In August, 1957, the fight for the open shop broke out on the coast, in Carmel, an artists-resort center in Monterey County. Petitions were circulated for signatures on Carmel streets by advocates of a city ordinance which would ban the union shop. Again, union organizational work that had begun to bear fruit preceded the demand for the ordinance. Proponents of the measure claimed that the movement grew out of a seven-weeks-old strike by the Monterey Culinary Workers.

Petitions bearing a total of some 1200 signatures were presented to the city council on September 3, 1957, and a hearing was set for October 9. At the meeting held on that date, the city attorney of Carmel pointed out the similarity of the ordinance to the Palm Springs ordinance, then still awaiting a ruling on its constitutionality by the District Court of Appeals, and urged the council to set the matter aside pending a decision by that court. Action on the ordinance was therefore postponed indefinitely.

As soon as the Appeals Court decision reaffirming the unconstitutionality of the

Palm Springs ordinance was announced in January, 1958, the open shop advocates, now known as the Carmel Committee to Guarantee the Right to Work, initiated a high-pressure campaign for signatures to a petition that would place the ordinance on the ballot in Carmel's coming municipal election. This move was successful, the city council granted the petition, and on April 8, the ordinance was adopted by a two-to-one majority.

The bitterness of the anti-union fight in Carmel rivalled that in Palm Springs. Half of the candidates for election to the city council managed to remain, publicly at least, neutral, but the other three openly identified themselves with the "right to work" movement, although all claimed the best interests of Carmel as their principal reason for running for office.

Trinity County

The day after the Carmel city council received the original petition for a "right to work" ordinance, the lightning struck in the far northern part of the state. By a vote of four to one, with no previous public discussion of the measure, the board of supervisors of Trinity County passed an ordinance banning the union shop. This action had been preceded by a whirlwind campaign by employer groups in the area, and was apparently aimed at the Retail Clerks, who were engaged in a dispute with several Trinity County grocery firms.

The ordinance, nearly identical to that already ruled unconstitutional in San Benito County and as without effect in incorporated areas in Tehama County, went into effect on September 18. The following day Judge C. A. Paulsen denied an employers' request for a temporary restraining order to halt picketing, and set October 4, 1957, for hearing arguments on the constitutionality of the ordinance. The judge's decision, upholding the constitutionality of the Trinity County ordinance, was handed down on October 15. This was the first favorable decision to be won by the "right to work" forces.

Immediately following the Paulsen ruling, appeal action to the higher courts was initiated by the State Federation of Labor. As in the Palm Springs and San Benito County cases, no further developments occurred until the following year. Because the three cases eventually were linked, the developments in each case will be discussed together below.

Yolo County

Sponsored by the Yolo County Farm

Bureau, a "right to work" ordinance was urged upon the Yolo County board of supervisors on September 10, 1957, but the blitz that had been successful the preceding week in Trinity County failed here. Action was postponed and a hearing on the ordinance set for October 1. Representatives of unions in the area attended the hearing and ably opposed the arguments of the Farm Bureau. The ordinance was decisively defeated by a vote of four to one.

El Centro

The city of El Centro in Imperial County was the next target, but here the attempt to push through a "right to work" ordinance was something of a fiasco. The author of the measure was a member of the El Centro city council, but when that body met on October 30, 1957, the date set to receive the proposal, he failed to put in an appearance.

State Federation President Thomas L. Pitts had been invited to the meeting by El Centro's mayor to speak on the question. Finding himself with no proposal at which to direct his attack, he requested and was granted to right to speak at any subsequent session of the council called to consider the actual presentation of an open shop ordinance. Such a session has never been called to date.

Contra Costa and Tuolumne Counties

The last news of the "right to work" ordinance campaign came from Contra Costa County early in January of this year. Preliminary work must have been started by the open-shoppers in Tuolumne County and then abandoned when the end of the ordinance phase of the overall "right to work" campaign was signalled. But before the Tuolumne County officials dropped the matter, they sent an inquiry to the Contra Costa supervisors as to whether that county had adopted or planned to adopt an ordinance banning the union shop, and were told that Contra Costa had no such intention.

Higher Court Action on "Right to Work" Ordinances

Although emphasis shifted at the beginning of 1958 from "right to work" ordinances to the "right to work" initiative proposal which became Proposition 18 on the November ballot, the ordinances were not, and still are not, a dead issue. Three of them have moved through the appellate courts, and a hearing before the

State Supreme Court is presently scheduled for early in December.

Trinity County Ordinance

When Trinity County's "right to work" ordinance was declared legal by Judge Paulsen, he also placed on the court calendar for trial a suit for injunction and damages brought against the Retail Clerks and Butchers by owners of a supermarket. The unions, backed by the Five-County Labor Council and the State Federation, promptly appealed to the District Court of Appeals to prevent Judge Paulsen from proceeding with the trial. In the first week in May, 1958, the appellate court denied the unions' petition and ordered the supermarket's case set for trial. The unions then went to the State Supreme Court, which accepted their appeal for further consideration, and issued a temporary writ of prohibition to prevent the Superior Court from proceeding with the case.

The Supreme Court hearing on the Trinity County ordinance was set for June 10 in Los Angeles, and was to have included the Palm Springs case as well. When the court met, however, one of the justices disqualified himself because his daughter was the wife of a partner in the law firm handling the appeal for the City of Palm Springs, and it proved impossible to find a substitute to sit pro tem. The attorney for Palm Springs refused to stipulate that the case could be heard by only a six-justice court, so the Palm Springs case was indefinitely put off the calendar, and oral arguments were heard on the Trinity County case. The Associated Farmers and the California State Federation of Labor were represented at the hearing as "interested parties," the Associated Farmers supporting the ordinance and the Federation's arguments against it being presented by its general counsel, Charles P. Scully. The attorneys arguing on behalf of the ordinance were general counsel for the California Association of Employers.

The justices took the Trinity County case under advisement, but no decision has been issued in the matter to date.

San Benito County Ordinance

On September 4, 1958, the California District Court of Appeal ruled on the appeal from Judge Lawson's decision holding the San Benito County ordinance to be unconstitutional. In a strongly worded unanimous opinion the appellate court upheld Judge Lawson's decision, declaring that the ordinance invaded a field already

occupied by state law, since it was the public policy of California to encourage voluntary associations of workers to bargain with their employers. Since the San Benito County ordinance impeded the ability to bargain, the court said, it was against the state's public policy; under such an ordinance, a large portion of the labor force would necessarily become non-union, which would lead to a significant weakening of the power of unions to bargain on terms of equality with their employers.

The appellate court's decision was immediately appealed by the advocates of the open shop, and on October 22, the State Supreme Court granted a hearing for early in December. The Palm Springs case, which had been indefinitely postponed on June 10, was also scheduled to be heard at the same time.

There, at this writing, the matter rests.

Federation Role In Ordinances Fight

The year-long "right to work" ordinance campaign, when viewed together with related and simultaneous developments, succeeded in fulfilling its main purpose—to focus constant attention throughout the state on the "right to work" issue, in preparation for the introduction onto the scene in January, 1958, of the "right to work" initiative constitutional amendment.

The maneuver worked both ways of course, as was inevitable in a state like California, where organized labor is strong and experienced. We were alerted at once to what was in the offing, and had a full year in which to mobilize our forces and finances, coordinate our efforts, and put our statewide educational program into effect.

At its meeting toward the end of June, 1957, the executive council of the California State Federation of Labor analyzed the "right to work" ordinance situation, fully aware of its larger long-term implications, but concentrating on meeting its immediate threat to the local labor movements throughout the state. The conclusions reached in this discussion were thereupon embodied in the following statement of policy:

Statement on "Right to Work" Local Ordinances

The carefully scheduled development of local "right to work" ordinances in numerous California communities makes essential a united program of labor resistance.

We would call the attention of all Californians to the fact that "right to work" agitators are spreading the doctrines of class hatred and class conflict to town after town. They are talking and preaching civil war. They are turning labor and management against one another in ways which can only leave ugly scars of hatred and bitterness. In seeking to destroy the labor movement, they are also destroying the economic and social stability of this great state.

They are destructionists in the most violent sense of the term. They will not stop until they stand over a prostrate union movement, until they have imposed the compulsory open shop in every city and county in California.

These enemies of industrial peace are powerful. They have erected a vast machine of intrigue and wealth. We of the labor movement must match their efficiency with the tools of democratic unionism.

In recognition of this crisis, the executive council of the California State Federation of Labor herewith announces the following policies of labor action:

(1) All legal actions should be centralized through the State Federation of Labor under the supervision of the chief counsel of the California State Federation of Labor. Litigation now pending on county "right to work" ordinances will affect the working conditions of Californians for decades to come. It is imperative that we have order in the legal sphere for it is here that the constitutional future of "right to work" programs is being determined.

(2) All appeals for defense funds in fighting "right to work" campaigns at the local level should be cleared through the executive council of the California State Federation of Labor. As the "right to work" network spreads through our California counties, more and more of our local councils and unions will require money to combat the anti-labor machinery. Conflicting appeals for financial aid will only breed confusion.

(3) All organizational and educational assistance at the command of the California State Federation of Labor will be given local unions and councils in their attempts to defeat or nullify "right to work" ordinances at the local community level. The secretary-treasurer of the State Federation will direct this program.

The secretary-treasurer was also authorized at this meeting to transfer whatever

funds were necessary from the Federation's organizing fund to establish a special "right to work" defense fund, if contributions from affiliates were not sufficient to get the program underway, and to prepare and issue educational materials to be used by local unions and councils in answering the attacks upon labor. (Later, on November 9, 1957, the CLLPE executive council authorized the transfer of CLLPE moneys to this special fund to aid in carrying out the program.)

Convention Action

"Right to work" was one of the two or three dominant themes of the State Federation's annual convention held in September, 1957, being referred to by many of the speakers, as well as being the subject of a statement of policy and two resolutions that were adopted by the convention, all of them, in essence, extensions and affirmations of the basic policy laid down by the Federation's executive council in June.

Federation Publications

Even before the convention met, a speakers' manual has been completed and mailed to all the central labor and building trades councils. This manual, entitled "Workers' Rights on Trial in California," contained a summary of facts, basic arguments, and samples of speeches as tools for an effective educational and speaking program, giving special attention to economic, moral and legal arguments involved in the "right to work" question, and providing a brief background of the national and California labor movements. By December, more than a thousand copies of this handbook had been distributed to unions and educational institutions.

In October, "What About the 'Right to Work' Fraud?", a pamphlet geared to the arguments of the city and county anti-labor forces and, in a general way, to possible statewide action through an initiative measure, was issued by the Federation and sent to local unions and councils for further distribution.

Local Council Action

All central labor councils had been urged in July by the executive council to establish committees to combat attempts to enact "right to work" ordinances within their jurisdictions and to undertake educational programs on the subject. Many unions responded quickly, forming rank and file committees to plan, program, and work actively against open shop agitation,

and to reach, in this way, not only their members, but their members' families, friends of the labor movement, and the public at large. A few far-sighted councils and local LLPE's set up speakers' training programs in connection with their anti-"right to work" activities, readying labor spokesmen for effective appearances before unions, church groups, service clubs, schools and civic bodies. A growing number held public meetings and rallies as well as educational conferences throughout the winter.

Labor Press Conference

When the Federation's eighth annual labor press conference was held on November 17-18, 1957, an entire afternoon session was devoted exclusively to the "right to work" question, although at that time "right to work" in California had not, as will be seen, advanced beyond the ordinance stage and campaign utterances by a few political candidates. Edward M. Weston, president of the merged Washington State Federation of Labor, reviewed the techniques and procedures used by the Washington labor movement in defeating a "right to work" initiative by better than two to one in 1956 (a victory which it duplicated in the 1958 election.)

"Right to Work" Enters Politics

By midyear 1957, it was evident that "right to work" was being cleverly manipulated so as to become a statewide issue in the election year of 1958. Its sudden emergence last summer as a red-hot political issue was due to Senator Knowland. During July and August of 1957 there were preliminary indications that "right to work" held a high place in his regard. In a radio and television interview in August, he compared it to the right to vote, and even to the right to worship God according to one's own conscience. Then, in an address on September 1 before a businessman's session in Sacramento honoring the State Chamber of Commerce and the 1957 State Fair, Knowland openly announced his position by calling for a "compulsory open shop system."

In the ensuing two weeks, which culminated with the opening of the California State Federation of Labor's annual convention, political leaders and outstanding candidates for office in 1958 felt obliged to speak out on the subject, three of them using the Federation's convention rostrum for the purpose. Without exception, all opposed any "right to work" measure:

Governor Goodwin Knight, Republican, then candidate for re-election; Attorney General Edmund G. Brown, Democratic candidate for Governor, and Congressman Clair Engle, Democratic candidate for the U. S. Senate. During the convention week, U. S. Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, Republican, announced his opposition to "right to work", and Vice President Richard Nixon let it be known that he was opposed to the issue going on the ballot in California. A week later Mayor George Christopher of San Francisco, Republican and a candidate for the U. S. Senate, declared that he favored the union shop and would vote against "right to work" proposals. Several candidates for state legislative offices also took sides at this time on "right to work."

"Right to Work" Initiative

In the second week of January, 1958, a self-styled Citizens Committee for Democracy in Labor Unions submitted a "right to work" initiative petition to the Attorney General's office in Sacramento for titling. Immediately thereafter, your secretary issued the following statement to the press:

Statement on the Initiative Attempt to Outlaw the Union Shop

Those of us in labor and management who have witnessed the constant and encouraging growth of intelligent industrial relations in California cannot but regret this action to turn unions and employers against one another in bitter and hateful combat.

This attempt to destroy the democratic processes of free collective bargaining in an hour of international crisis has been done in imitation of the dictator nations which first moved against the contractual liberties of labor and management.

What these agitators are saying is this: "Even though a majority of you workers and your employers want the union shop, even though you and your employers have freely agreed to it—we forbid such an agreement."

In simple terms, this means Big Government will rule management and labor.

This endeavor to stamp out democracy in industrial relations is not the program of any responsible segment of the business or industrial world. When the same issue was last on the state ballot in 1944, business and industrial leaders joined with labor and church groups in defeating the proposal by more than a half-million votes.

For the past decade and a half a small

group of agitators and malcontents have sought to have this pet project written into law by the state legislature. Having been consistently and overwhelmingly repudiated by the lawmakers, they have now turned to a public campaign of fraud and misrepresentation.

We ask all citizens interested in fair play and the future prosperity of California to ignore the petitions which would place this union-wrecking proposal on the November ballot.

To sign such a petition will not only jeopardize union health and welfare pension programs now protecting more than a million men, women and children in California, but will also drive a grave and dangerous blow at every retailer, merchant and manufacturer in the state whose financial hopes rest on the purchasing power of the wage earner public.

Further, the security of America requires industrial peace in the present world crisis. It is unthinkable that any true American would plunge labor and management into industrial warfare at a time when the survival of the nation demands stability on the production front.

In rapid succession, your secretary then (1) summoned twelve labor attorneys from throughout the state to a legal session on January 11 in the State Federation's headquarters in San Francisco; (2) called an emergency meeting of the Federation's executive council for the evening of January 17 in Los Angeles; and (3) called a strategy meeting of representatives of all central labor and building trades councils for January 25 in San Francisco. These were followed by (4) an appeal to all local unions and councils for a \$1.00 per member contribution to the "right to work" defense fund created by the Federation in June, 1957, and (5) a meeting with the Attorney General's staff on the question of a properly worded title and description of the "right to work" initiative petition, in accordance with state law which provides that both proponents and opponents of any initiative should be consulted in regard to its title and definition of the issue involved.

In the midst of this, the Federation's previously scheduled political conference was held in Los Angeles on January 17-18. The "right to work" threat placed added emphasis upon the need for intensive voter registration programs in all localities, and increased political education activity throughout the state.

January Strategy Meeting

By January 25, when central labor and building trades council representatives held their strategy meeting, the "right to work" initiative constitutional amendment had been titled by the Attorney General, "Employer-Employee Relations," and signature-getters were at work.

The meeting adopted the following resolution on the proposed initiative:

Whereas, An initiative constitutional amendment has been submitted to the Attorney General of California and titled by him for circulation in the state to qualify for the November general election ballot; and

Whereas, Under the guise of benefiting the workingman, the sponsors of the initiative, as detailed in the analysis submitted to this body today, seek the weakening and destruction of labor unions and the process of collecting bargaining, which historically have been the only vehicles for the betterment of the conditions of life of the workingman; and

Whereas, The initiative's end result would be not only destructive of the trade union movement, but more important, would destroy the peaceful institutions of labor-management relations developed over many years in California; and

Whereas, Such labor-management peace is absolutely necessary to California in attracting new industry to the state in our never-ending struggle to absorb our rapidly growing labor force and maintain a high level of employment; and

Whereas, It is unthinkable that true Americans would propose such disruptive legislation during the present period of international crisis and tension; and

Whereas, The real sponsors paying the large sums of money to propagandize and qualify the initiative are hiding behind a "front" organization calling itself the "Citizens Committee for Democracy in Labor Unions," which itself is a "front" for another "front" calling itself the "Citizens Committee for Voluntary Unionism," both of which are located in the "hotbeds of reaction" in the southern part of the state; and

Whereas, The real promoters of the vicious initiative are the Knowlands and the Chandlers and the few intellectually bankrupt big business organizations which are the willing stooges of the eastern imperialist big business interests who want to stir up disruption in the state in order to stop California's indus-

trial growth, and who want California to remain a "colony" of the would-be eastern industrial dictators; and

Whereas, As in a colony, they want to depress wages and the standard of living to hold back the competition of western industry which only now is beginning to make itself felt; and

Whereas, The working people of the state deplore the vast waste of money which will be expended to promote an initiative with such a harmful and destructive purpose; therefore be it

Resolved, That this assembly of central labor and building trades councils in the state of California hereby cast its lot on the side of industrial peace and the continued and necessary growth of California's economy against the destructive and disruptive efforts of the imperialist agitators and their stooges and front organizations; and be further

Resolved, That each and every council representative return to his area of the state and develop with the cooperation of union locals in his area a detailed program for the education of union members and the public generally as to the vicious crime being perpetrated against the state of California so that the initiative petition shall not qualify for the ballot, and thereby prevent the expenditure of money that would be wasted in connection with such a destructive measure, should it qualify for the ballot; and be it finally

Resolved, That the State Federation of Labor take immediate and full responsibility for effective coordination and implementation of this vital effort to help prevent the contemplated crime from actually being committed against the citizens and state of California, and that the Federation employ all of its resources towards this end.

In addition to other action described elsewhere in this report, delegates to this meeting voted to urge all local unions within their respective central labor and building trades jurisdictions to contribute at least \$1.00 per member to the State Federation's "right to work" defense fund.

Your secretary proposed to the delegates and subsequently sent to the various central labor bodies the following suggested steps for central council action in carrying out "right to work" strategy:

(1) Establish a general anti-"right to work" policy committee.

(2) The policy committee should establish at least the following subcommittees:

- (a) Voter registration committee for direction of local registration program.
- (b) Speakers' committee for union and general public talks.
- (c) Education committee for distribution of literature to unions, school, civic and church groups.
- (d) Publicity committee for local press, radio and TV coverage.
- (e) Citizens' committee for development of local citizens' committees, enlisting support of church, fraternal, business, civic and similar bodies to work against the measure.
- (f) Get-out-the-vote committee for precinct checking and car pooling on election day.

Federation Anti-Signature Campaign

To prevent the "right to work" initiative petition from receiving sufficient signatures to qualify for the ballot was our objective during the first half of this year. Because we knew that even if our efforts to accomplish this failed, all our educational work against the measure would be that much already done in the fight to defeat it at the polls, we launched a full-scale campaign against it. Meeting in April, 1958, the Federation's executive council voted unanimously to take whatever action was necessary to oppose the signature drive, and authorized your secretary to employ the necessary personnel and agency in any manner he deemed advisable and to use monies in the State Federation's Defense Fund for this purpose.

A placard headed "Don't sign THIS Petition!" had been sent in February to all local unions and councils for posting on headquarters bulletin boards. This placard, which was also issued in the Spanish language, contained the title and description of the initiative as it appeared in the hands of the signature-getters.

The placard was followed in March by a section-by-section legal analysis of the proposed measure, stating in clear, unequivocal language exactly what each section means, and how, if it were adopted, it would affect unions and union members.

A third publication, a pamphlet entitled, "A Moral Look at 'Right to Work' Laws," was also released at this time. This publication contained an indictment of "right to work" in statements by three

prominent California religious leaders: Reverend Andrew Juvinall, pastor of the First Methodist Church in Napa; Most Reverend Charles F. Buddy, Catholic Bishop of San Diego; and Rabbi Max Nussbaum of Temple Israel in Hollywood. All three condemned the "right to work" slogan as fraudulent, and denounced proposals to outlaw the union shop as immoral, a return to jungle competition and industrial strife, and a blow at social protections built up over the years. Copies were sent to all central labor bodies, with a request by your secretary that the councils mail a copy to each clergyman within their geographical jurisdiction. The Federation honored all requests for copies for bulk distribution to church and synagogue congregations.

Two valuable contributions to our educational materials were made by the AFL-CIO's Department of Education: the "right to work" kit, which had been prepared originally for college debaters and proved of immense value to us, and the anti-"right to work" film, "Injustice on Trial." Sixteen copies of the film were available through the State Federation headquarters from March on for showing by unions and councils.

A Spanish language circular was issued in May to reach the half a million Spanish-speaking people in the state, many of whom are wage earner members of various trade unions. Thousands of copies of these were distributed among farm workers by the National Agricultural Workers Union.

Meantime, by means of the Federation and CLLPE newsletters and releases to the labor press, the membership was kept informed of every development relating to the "right to work" fight, especially in California, but also in the several states facing the same issue. Support of our position from outside the labor movement was also reported to readers in the labor press, from the NAACP, the Catholic press, industry and industrialists, large and small, political organizations, farm groups, and others too numerous to mention. For example, copies of a reprint of an article on the compulsory open shop from the Christian Century, a national Protestant weekly, and of a question-and-answer pamphlet on "right to work" issued by the Catholic Council on Working Life, were enclosed with the Federation's Weekly News Letter. And throughout this entire period, many excellent, effective, and always well attended anti-"right to work" public meetings were held under the auspices of our unions and councils.

That our campaign against signing the petition was effective was evident in April, when the "right to work" people met the first filing date for petition signatures with far short of a sufficient number of names. To meet the final filing date of June 26, it was necessary for them to go to extreme lengths. As a result of greatly increased expenditures, tremendous pressure on white-collar corporation employees, and the like, the measure was finally qualified.

The Fight vs. Proposition 18

As soon as the "right to work" initiative petition became Proposition 18, your secretary wrote to all the local unions and councils, underlining the seriousness of the campaign we faced and asking for financial assistance. The letter stated, in part:

You are by now aware that the "right to work" forces have qualified their measure for the November ballot. Labor's opposition to the anti-union shop proposition must now be geared to a statewide election, with tactics altered to meet the broad public aspects of the crisis.

During the past six months, your California State Federation of Labor gave first emphasis to internal education—the education of union members on the union shop question. To achieve this goal, we published and distributed more than 3,000,000 pieces of informative literature through the medium of our affiliates. Further, we joined with local unions and central bodies in the promotion of rallies and forums designed to reach the membership. Beyond this, we presented our materials and speakers to service clubs and church groups and schools throughout the entire state. In this effort, we argued labor's case before countless Rotary and Kiwanis clubs, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish organizations and college classes.

At the state level, however, we now enter the broader phase of television, radio and billboard advertising. We now enter the phase of citizens' committees and campaign headquarters. We now enter a ballot campaign requiring the use of every possible instrument of public education.

This means money. Our opponents are prepared to spend almost unlimited funds to break our unions and impose the compulsory open shop on the working people of the state. They have in the leadership of their movement

some of the wealthiest men in California. They are planning to saturate California with anti-labor propaganda designed to pass the vicious "right to work" law.

If we are to meet and defeat this challenge, we must have sufficient funds to make an effective campaign under the direction and coordination of the California State Federation of Labor.

Many of our unions and councils in California have made substantial contributions up to this time to our State Federation of Labor Defense Fund, and a number of others have made small or partial contributions. We are now required to strongly and respectfully urge all of those local unions and councils which have made partial contributions of less than the minimum of \$1.00 per member, to make an additional contribution on the above basis, and all of those local unions and councils which have made no contribution to do so without delay, as time is important if we are to properly budget the numerous projects required for a successful campaign.

It would be a terrible tragedy if we allowed this measure to become law because of lack of sufficient funds.

Because we had the complete support of all of our unions and councils in 1944, this measure was defeated by approximately 600,000 votes. We can accomplish the same result in the year of 1958, but only if we receive the full and active support, financially and otherwise, of all of our councils and affiliated unions in this state.

The need is great — the time is extremely short.

At this writing, the successful conclusion of our campaign against Proposition 18 is so recent that a detailed story must await a later report. Your secretary's account here will therefore be done only in broadest outline.

For statewide director of the Citizens Committee Against Proposition 18, we appointed Curtis Roberts of the San Francisco public relations firm of Gross and Roberts, a public relations man being chosen in recognition of the tremendous sympathetic interest in our cause already displayed by persons outside the ranks of labor. At the same time, the political research firm of Hal Dunleavy and Associates was retained to make regular statewide samplings of our strength and weakness as the campaign progressed.

Citizens Committee offices were opened at once in San Francisco and Los Angeles, and a little later in Oakland, Sacramento, Fresno, Bakersfield and San Diego.

Coordinating Conference

In a day-long conference held in San Francisco toward the end of July, coordination of statewide activities to defeat the proposition was discussed by representatives from all councils throughout the state. State CIO officials also participated. The growing opposition of non-union voters in every walk of life to the "right to work" measure would, we knew, play a meaningful role in our overall planning, if efficiently coordinated with our own program. The results of the vote on Proposition 18 are proof of how well this was carried out. Typical of the outside support we received was the calibre of the men who headed the Southern California Citizens Committee as co-chairmen: Robert Fenton Craig, former president of the California Republican Assembly, professor of Business Administration at the University of Southern California and member of the boards of directors of twenty-nine corporations, and John Anson Ford, a long-time Democratic party leader and member of the Los Angeles board of supervisors.

In mid-September, television and radio advertising against Proposition 18 was inaugurated over eight TV stations and twenty-eight radio outlets under auspices of the Citizens Committee; coverage in major metropolitan areas of the state began on October 7. Each of the stations carried a hundred announcements a week until November 3.

The temptation to describe the kind of campaign that was carried on in favor of Proposition 18 is very great, but space does not permit more than the all-inclusive statement that it was savage and ruthless, replete with bluster, name-calling, scurrilous lies and misinformation of every sort, and precisely what might be expected from those who desired to force the compulsory open shop on unions and industry alike.

As the campaign neared its close, the Federation coined and broadcast widely the slogan, "Vote First—and Vote NO—on Proposition 18!" This, we hoped, would counter the recognized tendency, revealed in numerous studies of voting habits, for voters to ignore and fail to vote upon measures at the end of a ballot listing. And during the final week before the election, unions and councils were urged to have their "get-out-the-vote" plans in

readiness for November 4, since a heavy vote by labor was essential.

On Sunday, two days before the election, a two-hour television "spectacular" against Proposition 18 was carried by every major TV station in the state. Stars of the show included Eddie Cantor, Ralph Bellamy, Robert Preston, Mercedes McCambridge, George Jessel, Sammy Davis, Jr., Hans Conreid, Penny Singleton, Mort Sahl, Dr. Frank Baxter, Billy Daniels, Howard Keel, Jan Sterling and Frank Lovejoy. Guests of honor were candidates Edmund G. Brown, Clair Engle and Goodwin J. Knight.

Outside Support

The support given our efforts by individuals and organizations outside of the labor movement cannot be too highly praised. A partial listing will indicate the powerful backing we received from these sources.

Religious groups included the Los Angeles Church Federation, embracing twenty-six Protestant and Eastern Orthodox denominations; the Catholic Labor Institute of Los Angeles; the Congregational Conference of Southern California; the California-Nevada Methodist Conference; the Southern California Board of Rabbis; the National Catholic Welfare Conference; the Synagogue Council of America; the National Catholic Weekly, "America"; the Roman Catholic Diocese of San Diego in the person of its Bishop, the Most Reverend Charles F. Buddy.

Other organizations were: the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; the National Community Service Organization, the west coast's largest Mexican-American organization; the National Farmers Union, an organization of growers; the California Licensed Farm Contractors Association; the Fraternal Order of Eagles at its national convention; the California State Nurses Association; the San Francisco Veterans Political Council, composed of members of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, American Veterans of World War II, Spanish American War Veterans, and several lesser known groups.

Individuals included President Clark Kerr of the University of California; Paul St. Sure, president of the Pacific Maritime Association and former representative of the California Processors and Growers and Produce Manufacturers Associations in labor negotiations; A. Ronald Button, State Treasurer and former na-

tional committeeman of the Republican Party in California; John S. Watson, past president of the Associated Farmers; former President Harry S. Truman; Fred Hall, former Republican governor of Kansas.

Publications, Motion Pictures, Speeches

Leaflets, pamphlets, reprints of articles, too numerous to list by the title and source, some issued by the California State Federation of Labor and other labor organizations, some from the national AFL-CIO, many from sources outside the labor movement; windshield and bumper stickers, placards—these poured out from Federation headquarters in an apparently unending stream to our affiliated unions and councils and friendly, non-union groups in every part of the state, in answer to their requests. The number of copies of printed materials thus distributed exceeded ten million.

The National Council for Industrial Peace was of enormous assistance. This citizens' committee is headed by John M. Redding, former assistant postmaster general; two of its executives are Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and former U. S. Senator Herbert Lehman. As early as May its offer of assistance to our campaign—offered to labor in all states where "right to work" measures were on the ballot—was accepted. The council furnished us with pamphlets, speakers' manuals, and two excellent films, "We the People" and "It's A Good Business." Hundreds of showings of both these films were made throughout the state.

As for debates participated in and speeches made by the Federation's officers and staff members, as well as by spokesmen for our local unions and councils, it is doubtful if the total will ever be known. This activity was widespread, continuous and effective.

Victory in November

"Right to Work" was beaten at the November 4 election by nearly a million votes. When the official returns are issued, they will undoubtedly show that at least fifty-four of the state's fifty-eight counties voted down Proposition 18, and that, statewide, the NO vote was not less than 60 per cent of the total number of votes cast.

The following statement on Proposition 18 was issued by your secretary as soon as the extent of labor's victory was known:

The smashing defeat of Proposition 18 reflects the good judgment of the peo-

ple of California who voted to uphold the democratic concept of majority rule in collective bargaining.

Our victory is primarily due to the tireless, heroic work of unions and councils which all over California took up the task of educating the public on the essentials of Proposition 18.

The compulsory open shop would have brought industrial chaos and ultimate economic stagnation to California.

The passage of Proposition 18 would not only have meant a low wage economy, but further, would have placed in mortal jeopardy the health and welfare plans and pension programs which now protect almost a million and a half workers in the state.

Now that this threat to democratic unionism has been vanquished, we are free to resume normal relationships with the business community of the state.

Together we have built the most productive and promising state in the nation. Together we can establish a greater California.

In this hour of triumph, labor looks to the future, not to the past. We must think now in terms of continued progress for the working people, as we struggle for a more democratic and more secure society.

What of the Future?

"Right to work" proposals were rejected in five of the six states where they appeared on the ballot. Near-record voter turnouts defeated the compulsory open shop measures in California, Colorado, Idaho, Ohio and Washington. Only in the farm state of Kansas did the measure carry.

After the election, the executive council of the AFL-CIO issued the following statement:

The voters in five states resoundingly defeated the so-called "right to work" law, demonstrating their belief in free trade unions and free collective bargaining.

In these elections, the labor movement had the staunch support of countless Americans of good will, who believe as we do that destruction of the labor movement would do irreparable damage to one of the bulwarks of democracy.

Our sincere thanks goes to each of these friends of labor. We especially thank those citizens of all shades of political thought who joined with organ-

ized labor to defeat these evil anti-union proposals.

We assure the voters who defeated these proposals that their confidence in the basic integrity of American trade unions will never be regretted.

At the same time, the AFL-CIO executive council declared that although cynical attempts to make political capital out of isolated instances of corruption in labor's ranks were defeated in the election, the problem of meeting corruption in the labor-management field remained. The council authorized AFL-CIO President George Meany to appoint a special committee of council members to devote itself immediately to the problem of securing this necessary, constructive legislation.

The council also reiterated its determination to seek general revision of the Taft-Hartley Act, with particular attention to Section 14-b, the section of the act that permits the states to enact "right to work" laws. That a move by organized labor in the eighteen states with compulsory open shop laws will be made to repeal these laws is also confidently expected.

But the "right to work" threat remains, and in the midst of our rejoicing over its decisive defeat this year in five states, organized labor must remain vigilant and alert.

A few days after the elections, W. T. Harrison, executive director of the National Right-to-Work Committee, indicated that this group was not unduly perturbed by its 1958 defeats, and that it had "just begun to fight" both on a national and state level. Within a week of the election, the committee approved a stepped-up offensive, announcing that the battleground would shift to state legislatures in Wyoming, New Mexico and probably Maryland, while educational campaigns would be renewed in Washington, Colorado and Montana. The National Right-to-Work Committee, which claims 9,000 business members and 5,000 "worker" members, can also be counted on to oppose labor's efforts to obtain the repeal of state "right to work" laws and Section 14-b of the Taft-Hartley Act.

What of the future? We in California shall be ready, as we have been for the last fourteen years, to meet every threat of the "right to work" forces. We do not underestimate the danger of these treacherous enemies of organized labor. Their goal is a national compulsory open shop law, and they show no sign of relinquishing it. If they decide to try again in Cali-

fornia, as well they might, although it is our fervent hope that they will not, they will come up against a strong, united and experienced labor movement, backed by good friends in every walk of life, and they will be defeated again!

OTHER INITIATIVE PROPOSALS

Tax Revision Initiative

At its meeting in January, 1958, the Federation's executive council discussed at great length the question of supporting an initiative measure to give relief to the low- and middle-income taxpayers of California. There was unanimous agreement as to the need for state tax revision to reduce the onerous burden imposed by the state sales tax and achieve a more equitable distribution of the state income tax in keeping with labor's historic opposition to the sales tax and in accord with labor's equally historic position calling for taxation based upon the ability to pay. The executive council voted to support the measure.

A week later, at the "right to work" strategy meeting called by the Federation, the two hundred central labor council and building trades delegates present voted to endorse and support a major tax revision initiative which had been filed on January 22 with the Attorney General for petition title.

Sponsored by the Citizens Committee for Tax Equality, the tax initiative proposed to (1) slash the state sales tax from three to two percent; (2) reduce the state personal income tax on single persons earning less than \$8,000 and married couples earning less than \$15,500; and (3) increase the state income tax on the wealthy to a maximum of 46 per cent on taxable incomes over \$50,000.

Volunteer petition forms were sent by the Federation to the officials of all central labor and building trades councils, and the signature-getting campaign got underway.

Immediate public enthusiasm for this proposal was unprecedented. Within a month, 150,000 signatures had been obtained, and the names of 575,000 registered voters were on the forms submitted to county registrars on the first filing date, April 28. Only 322,429 valid signatures were required to qualify the measure for the ballot; 375,000 valid signatures went to the Secretary of State on the tax revision petitions.

Hysterical opposition to the proposal,

now known as Proposition 17, was immediate and mounted to incredible heights as the November election approached. As early as May, your secretary warned that the hysterical big money opponents of the measure had started a campaign of deceit and even blatant lies to trick the people into thinking that the measure was against their best interests and those of the state. Some opponents claimed that the sales tax cut would reduce sales tax revenues by \$200 million, as if this would be lost by the state. They chose to hide the fact that the income tax revision in the measure would recapture all but an insignificant portion of this make-believe loss. We also pointed out that the Franchise Tax Board's estimates of increased state income tax receipts, based on 1956 income statistics and adjusted for income increases since then, revealed that the state treasury is well protected; and that the state fiscal crisis which the frantic opponents wanted to blame on the tax initiative was one that would exist even if the measure had never been proposed because of the refusal of the legislature to face up to the crisis.

Charges that the proposal would ruin our schools were branded by your secretary as outright lies, for the constitution of California gives priority to the schools on all general fund revenues of the state. It was emphasized that the measure could not possibly affect in any way, shape or form, the large state appropriation being made to the support of our public schools, and that to say that the measure would affect future appropriations was to say that the legislators and the next governor of California could not be trusted to provide for our growing school needs.

So violent was the outcry of the wealthy few against Proposition 17 that your secretary was impelled to issue the following statement in May:

Proposition 17, popularly identified as the sales tax reduction initiative, will redistribute California's tax burden, giving relief to better than 90 per cent of the taxpayers.

Not only will this be realized without jeopardy to the financial position of the state, but the revision will in fact add some \$80 million annually to California purchasing power.

The cries now raised against the measure voice the fears of the wealthy few. It is perhaps understandable that they should fight to retain their present

tax privileges. However, they should realize that history and justice are against them.

Let us consider the following facts:

(1) Although the cutting of the state sales tax from 3 per cent to 2 per cent will benefit ALL income groups, low and middle-income taxpayers will profit most; low-income individuals now carry a sales tax burden at least 150 per cent greater than those in the upper brackets.

(2) The measure will reduce the income tax paid by individuals filing single returns who have taxable incomes (gross income less deductions) of less than \$9,167. All married couples filing joint returns who have taxable incomes of less than \$18,335 would also pay a smaller income tax. Persons filing state income tax returns with taxable incomes above these respective amounts would in turn pay a progressively larger state income tax.

(3) The recapturing of revenue lost by the sales tax reduction will be basically realized through providing state income tax rates ranging from $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on taxable incomes under \$5,000 to 46 per cent on taxable incomes over \$50,000, instead of the present range of 1 per cent on taxable incomes under \$5,000 to 6 per cent on taxable incomes over \$25,000. These ranges apply in the case of single returns.

Where a husband and wife file a joint return the rates would range from $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on taxable incomes below \$10,000 to 46 per cent on taxable incomes over \$100,000, instead of present rates ranging from 1 per cent on taxable incomes below \$10,000 to 6 per cent on taxable incomes above \$50,000. This will mean increased state taxation for only the top 10 per cent of California taxpayers. They will pay a total of \$197 million in additional taxes to the state of California. However, they will be able to deduct \$133.5 million of this from their federal income tax, thus giving new strength to the California economy.

(4) The increase in state income tax revenues will replace revenue losses from the sales tax cut within a margin representing less than 1 per cent of state general fund revenues. In using State Franchise Tax Board estimates to show a large loss, the opponents of the initiative have conveniently ignored the fact that the Board's estimates were based on per-

sonal income statistics for 1956, and have made no adjustment for subsequent increases in personal income.

(5) The present state tax structure has been so inadequate and so lopsided in favor of the wealthy that the 1959 session of the legislature will face a budget deficit of about \$200 million. The tax revision measure has nothing to do with the deficit. On the contrary, it will establish a basic, constitutional foundation for the raising of additional revenues by a fair and democratic formula. It will become the duty of the 1959 legislature to obtain additional moneys to meet the expanding needs of the state. We insist that this must be done on the basis of ability to pay. The present fiscal crisis was brought about by the success of the wealthy few in exempting themselves from bearing an equitable share of the state tax burden.

(6) There is nothing in the initiative measure which either alters the priority on revenues given our public school system, or in any way prevents the state from meeting its overall fiscal needs. Indeed, by calling upon the wealthy few to pay a fair share of the state tax bill, the initiative strengthens the fiscal base of California.

In August, preliminary samplings of public opinion on Proposition 17 were such as to send the big money interests and their political protectors up and down the state into a frenzy to save their preferred tax position. The polls showed that voters favoring the measure outnumbered those opposed to it by a substantial majority. From this time on, there was a virtual "blackout" by the commercial press of the facts that spoke clearly for the adoption of Proposition 17. Only the fantastic distortions of its opponents were spread across the pages of the dailies.

The time, money and energy consumed by our battle against the "right to work" initiative did not permit us to wage the kind of campaign for Proposition 17 required to overcome its opponents' campaign against it. Indicating the calibre of the big guns firing on the tax revision initiative, the two largest contributions—and they were large—made to the anti-Proposition 17 forces, as revealed in the report of the Secretary of State, were from the Pacific Gas and Electric Company and the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company.

A month before the election your secretary issued a last statement in which

he charged that California's fiscal deficit of \$200 million was primarily the result of tax protection given to major special interest groups, and cited the following four major areas of tax privilege:

(1) **Corporation License Tax**—California realized approximately \$872,000 from this tax in 1957. In the same year this tax brought \$142 million to Pennsylvania and \$64 million to Massachusetts.

(2) **Severance Tax**—California is second among the states in producing mineral wealth, mainly oil and gas. Most of the other great oil and gas producing states have severance (removal from earth) taxes which serve as a major source of revenue. A severance tax in California would bring the state about \$70 million annually. In 1957, severance taxes brought Texas \$189 million, Louisiana, \$78 million and Oklahoma, \$34 million.

(3) **Horse Racing Tax**—California applies a tax of 5.8 per cent on money wagered in horse racing; Florida gets 8.6 per cent, New Jersey 8.7. If the Florida tax were applied in California, the state's revenue would be up \$11 million a year.

(4) **Documentary and Stock Transfer Tax**—California has no such tax. In 1957, this tax brought New York \$39 million; Pennsylvania, \$20 million; Florida, \$12 million.

After that, with the closing weeks of our campaign against Proposition 18 upon us, it was no longer possible for us to give any effective support to Proposition 17.

The defeat of this measure at the election, much as we regret it, has had, however, its compensations. As much by the widely publicized outcry against it by the corporations and the wealthy as by our support of it, this clear statement of labor's historic insistence that taxes should be based upon the ability to pay, and its direct and implied criticism of the lopsided tax structure of our state focused attention as never before on the need to revise our tax laws. As a result, labor's position has gained a firm core of support for future attempts to ease the tax burden of the low- and middle-income people. This proposal will be heard from again.

Water Initiative

Another initiative measure embodying, as Proposition 17 did, an historic position of labor, but intended for the 1960 ballot, was given endorsement by the Federa-

tion's executive council at its May 1958 meeting.

Sponsored by the California Water and Power Users Association, of which the Federation is a member organization, and strongly backed by the California State Grange, this measure declares that taxpayer-financed water from state water development projects shall not be furnished to irrigate more than 160 acres held by one landowner or 320 acres by husband and wife; in other words, it proposed to write into the California constitution the 160-acre limitation feature of federal law which now applies only to federally financed water projects.

Support of the 160-acre limitation principle has, of course, been a part of state AFL policy for nearly half a century. In our opinion, such a measure, if adopted, would (1) prevent "land barons" from capturing water tax subsidies running into millions of dollars; (2) end the power of land speculators who hold farm lands until their value is increased by taxpayer-financed irrigation waters; and (3) break up the large corporation-owned farms which are now forcing California's small farmers out of existence. Large landholders would be entitled to subsidized water in excess of 160 acres, providing they first agreed to sell such excess lands within a period of 10 years at a price that did not include the added value resulting from the availability of state-financed water.

Copies of the petition were mailed to all unions and councils for signature-getting, but it was, unfortunately, a bad time to ask our affiliates, already exerting themselves to the fullest in the campaign to defeat the "right to work" initiative, to undertake this additional task. On August 1, the first filing date, it was evident that it would be impossible under the circumstances to obtain a sufficient number of signatures by the October 5 deadline. Regretfully, we ceased our efforts to continue the voluntary circulation drive. This proposed initiative will undoubtedly be again our concern in the future.

V

LEGAL SERVICES

Report of

Attorney Charles P. Scully

Court Cases

McCarroll v. Los Angeles District Council of Carpenters, et al.

In accordance with the request of rep-

resentatives of the unions affected, I conferred with Attorney Garrett and with representatives of the Council during the month of December, 1957.

In accordance with the request of the interested parties, I prepared and filed with the United States Supreme Court a Petition for Writ of Certiorari from the final decision of the State Supreme Court, which in effect held that when an action is brought for a breach of contract the state court can also grant injunctive relief even though a federal court could not grant such relief for the same federal remedy.

The United States Supreme Court denied certiorari and the case is currently pending on trial on the merits.

Garmon v. San Diego Building Trades Council, et al.

Since my last report, the California State Supreme Court, by a decision of 4-3, after the return of the case from the United States Supreme Court, sustained the decision of the trial court and held that although it was improper for the trial court to have awarded injunctive relief as was found by the United States Supreme Court, it was permissible for them to award damages. In making this decision, the State Supreme Court completely reversed a long line of previous decisions.

I then prepared and filed with the United States Supreme Court a second Petition for Certiorari, which has been granted and which will be argued during the term commencing October, 1958.

The opening brief has been prepared and filed with the United States Supreme Court and undoubtedly the oral argument will be scheduled nearly next year.

In the course of this case since its decision by the United States Supreme Court, I have conferred with the interested parties and their attorneys in Los Angeles, and San Diego, both prior to the oral argument before the second decision of the California State Supreme Court and since such decision, and the granting of the Petition for Certiorari by the United States Supreme Court.

Trinity County "Right to Work" Ordinance Case

Since my last report on this case, we prepared and filed with the Superior Court of Trinity County a motion to dismiss on the ground that the action was pre-empted under the federal law. This motion was denied and subsequently we prepared and filed with the California State District

Court of Appeal in Sacramento a petition for a writ of prohibition to prohibit the Superior Court of Trinity County from proceeding with the trial on the action. This writ was denied and a petition for rehearing was then filed with the State Supreme Court. This petition was granted and on June 10, 1958, I appeared before the California State Supreme Court in Los Angeles and presented oral argument on this matter. The case is still under submission and no decision has been received to date.

Palm Springs "Right to Work" Ordinance Case

Since my last report on this matter, the District Court of Appeal in Southern California issued a favorable decision and struck down the local "right to work" ordinance and held it could not properly be enforced. A petition for rehearing was then filed and granted by the California State Supreme Court.

Upon the instructions of the Secretary, I filed a brief *amicus curiae* on behalf of the State Federation with the California State Supreme Court, and although the matter was scheduled for argument in Los Angeles before the California State Supreme Court on June 10, 1958, at the same time as the argument presented by me in the Trinity County case, in view of the fact that one of the justices disqualified himself and the attorney for the city was unwilling to stipulate to a replacement, the case went off calendar. To my knowledge, the case has not been rescheduled for argument as of this time.

San Benito "Right to Work" Ordinance Case

Since my last report, in accordance with instructions of the Secretary, I filed a brief *amicus curiae* with the District Court of Appeal in San Francisco and oral argument was heard in San Francisco on August 27, 1958. The court issued a unanimous decision striking down the ordinance. The State Supreme Court on its own motion granted a hearing and has scheduled oral argument for December 2, 1958.

People v. Osslo, et al.

Since my last report, the California State Supreme Court, by a 4-3 decision, sustained the judgment of the trial court finding the individuals involved guilty as charged. Subsequently, a petition for rehearing was filed by me and denied, whereupon a Petition for Certiorari to the United States Supreme Court was prepared and filed personally by me on April 29, 1958. At the same time, an application for

stay of the order was requested and granted by the Supreme Court. Subsequently, this Petition for Certiorari was denied and the stay vacated and the individuals appeared before the trial judge in San Diego on June 23, 1958, for sentencing. At that time, the defendants requested that the judge not impose any probationary terms and that they be sentenced as required by law. This the judge refused to permit and accordingly insisted that the individuals would have to undertake the onerous probationary sentences originally imposed by him and remitted them to jail.

Subsequently, we prepared and filed with the California State Supreme Court a series of applications for extraordinary writs, including writs of mandate, prohibition and habeas corpus.

The California State Supreme Court granted our application for a writ of habeas corpus and scheduled the return to be heard before it in Los Angeles on Monday, September 29, 1958. Pending the hearing on the return to the writ, the defendants were ordered released on bail in the sum of \$2500 each. I appeared and presented oral argument to the court on September 29, 1958, but the case is still pending for decision.

Kal V. Lines v. State of California

This matter involved a ruling by the Federal Circuit Court of Appeal in which certain priority rights were granted to taxes over and above those to wage payments in a bankruptcy proceedings.

After conferring with the Secretary, I prepared and filed a brief *amicus curiae* in support of a Petition for Certiorari with the United States Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, however, denied the petition and the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeal is now final.

Jensen, et al (Lafayette Dime and Dollar Store) v. Contra Costa County Central Labor Council, et al

This case involves an action for damages patterned after the *Garmon* decision, and at the request of the Secretary of the Contra Costa County Central Labor Council, we were assigned by the Secretary of the Federation to represent them.

We have prepared and filed a demurrer and motion to dismiss, which were heard in the Superior Court of Contra Costa County at Martinez on September 15, 1958. While our motion to dismiss was denied, our demurrer was sustained and additional pleadings were filed. We again filed a demurrer and a motion to dismiss, which

were again argued in the same court on November 10, 1958, but no decision has been rendered as yet.

Unemployment Insurance

Governor's Advisory Council

Since my last report, I have attended the following meetings of the Council:

September 10, 1957	San Francisco
December 19, 1957	San Francisco
January 16, 1958	Los Angeles
June 24, 1958	San Francisco
August 14, 1958	San Francisco
October 9, 1958	San Diego

San Francisco Machinists' Strike

Since my last annual report to the convention on this matter, I conferred with Attorney Fishgold, attorney for the I.A.M., in my office on August 6, 1957, and on August 26, 1957, attended a pretrial conference at the Department of Employment in which it was agreed that certain procedures would be followed by the respective groups in order to eliminate the amount of time that would be required for the hearing.

I met with representatives of the Machinists and their counsel in my office on November 21, 1957, at which it developed there would not be compliance with the original agreement reached between all interested parties. As a result of this situation, with the consent of the Secretary I withdrew from the proceedings.

Regulations

On October 10, 1957, I attended a meeting of the Labor-Management Committee in San Francisco to review the proposed regulations being submitted by the Department as a result of the changes at the last legislative session. On the whole, the suggestions were procedural in nature and I expressed our general agreement with the proposals, and they were adopted without objection.

Fishermen

On February 4, 1958, I met with representatives of the Fishermen's Union, including Messrs. Hawk, Waugh and Crivello, and discussed the problem of elective coverage for fishermen. I explained in detail the implications involved in the law and advised them that they should make their policy determination based upon that explanation. I do not know what policy determination has been made and have received no further contact in this regard.

Workmen's Compensation Proposed Rule Changes

On October 9, 1957, I attended a hearing before the Commission in San Francisco and on October 23, 1957, attended a hearing before the Commission in Los Angeles with respect to the proposed rules submitted by the Commission. I explained the position of the Federation in detail at such hearings and expressed our regret that the joint recommendations previously submitted by the State Chamber-State Federation had not been acted upon. In addition, I submitted a summary of our position in writing.

As indicated above, the Commission proceeded with a substantial revision of their existing rules and regulations. On March 10, 1958, I attended an all-day hearing in Los Angeles and on March 20, 1958, I attended an all-day hearing in San Francisco and presented the views of the Federation. Since that date, the Commission has adopted the revised rules and with certain exceptions adopted changes which were not detrimental to us. In some regards, however, they refused to adopt our suggestions, particularly with respect to the necessity of supplying medical reports on demand.

On the whole, however, there appears to be nothing in the rules which will seriously affect the rights of applicants appearing before this Commission.

On October 2, 1958, I met with Insurance Company representatives at the Commercial Club, San Francisco, and discussed with them their policies dealing with determining of average wages. They are to submit a statement of policy in the near future.

Merger

Since my last annual report, I have attended numerous meetings of both the Federation Merger Committee and the Joint Merger Committee on the following dates:

August 1, 1957	San Francisco
October 11, 1957	Hollywood
October 26, 1957	San Francisco
October 27, 1957	San Francisco
October 28, 1957	San Francisco
November 23, 1957	Hollywood
November 24, 1957	Hollywood
November 25, 1957	Hollywood
April 16, 1958	Hollywood
June 4, 1958	San Francisco
June 5, 1958	San Francisco
June 12, 1958	San Francisco
June 13, 1958	San Francisco
July 9, 1958	Los Angeles

July 10, 1958	Los Angeles
July 11, 1958	Los Angeles
August 11, 1958	San Francisco
August 23, 1958	San Francisco
November 6, 1958	San Francisco
November 7, 1958	San Francisco

As a result of general agreement on merger at the meeting in Los Angeles on July 11, 1958, I was assigned the duty of preparing the proposed merger agreement documents, particularly the Constitution. In accordance with instructions, I prepared such documents and forwarded them to the interested parties. As a result of the meeting of the subcommittee on August 11, 1958, a final draft of the document was prepared for submission to the joint groups for action. On August 23, 1958, the Joint Merger Committee adopted favorably the Agreement to Merge, the Rules and Regulations and the Constitution and submitted them to the respective groups for action. The following week the Executive Board of the Federation approved the recommendation of its Merger Committee and by the CIO on September 9, 1958.

After final action by the CIO group, I was instructed to and did prepare the final documents for final execution and they have been printed and will be distributed to all delegates to the convention. Accordingly, I do not see any reason for discussing them at length here.

In addition to the above, on December 3, 1957, I worked out with the auditors of the Federation the details leading up to the final audit for the period ending in December, 1957, covering Federation operations.

Pension Committees

Federation Office Program

On August 7 and August 13, 1957, I conferred in the offices of the Federation with representatives of the Federation and of the Bank of America with respect to this program.

On November 23, 1957, in Hollywood, I met with Secretary-Treasurer Haggerty and representatives of Occidental to work out the final details of this program. Since such date, an application for ruling of exemption has been filed with the Internal Revenue Bureau and is currently pending.

State Pension Program

Since my last report, the state pension program for offices of affiliates and their employees has been circularized throughout the state. The results of such public-

ity undoubtedly will be reported by the Secretary, and accordingly will not be repeated by me. On August 13, 1957, and November 7, 1957, I met with the Federation Pension Committee in the offices of the Federation; and on April 22, 1958, I met with Secretary Haggerty and Consultant Segal to review various implications of the program. The last conference was with Secretary Haggerty, President Pitts and Consultant Segal on September 23, 1958.

Executive Board Meetings

Since my last report, I have attended the following meetings of the Executive Board:

September 13, 1957—Oakland.
November 8, 1957—San Francisco.
November 9, 1957—San Francisco.
January 17, 1958—Los Angeles (Special meeting on "Right to Work").
April 26, 1958—San Francisco (Special meeting on "Right to Work").
May 24, 1958—Hollywood.
May 25, 1958—Hollywood.
August 24, 1958—San Francisco.
August 25, 1958—San Francisco.

Convention

I attended the convention of the Federation in Oakland from September 14 through September 20, 1957, and assisted the committees and the various delegates as requested.

Advisory Committee to the Insurance Commission with Respect to the Regulation of Health & Welfare Programs

At the last session of the Legislature, there was enacted into law the so-called Rees-Doyle bill dealing with the regulation of so-called health and welfare programs.

Subsequently, the Governor appointed, in accordance with the provisions of the law, an Advisory Council consisting of seven individuals, and I was designated as one of the seven to serve.

Since that time, numerous meetings of the Advisory Council have been held and an additional Technical Council has been created at the suggestion of the Advisory Council in order to assist the Commissioner in producing reasonable rules and regulations dealing with this program.

I have attended the following meetings of the Advisory Council:

December 11, 1957	San Francisco
January 24, 1958	Los Angeles

March 7, 1958	San Francisco
April 18, 1958	Los Angeles
May 12, 1958	San Francisco
May 13, 1958	San Francisco
May 14, 1958	San Francisco
June 14, 1958	San Francisco
September 26, 1958	San Francisco
October 22, 1958	San Francisco

In addition, certain public hearings have been scheduled by the Commissioner dealing with the procedures for registration and for annual statements and annual accounts. I attended the first public hearing on May 20, 1958, in Los Angeles; the second hearing on June 30, 1958, in San Francisco; and the third on September 22, 1958, in San Francisco.

As a result of these conferences and hearings, a serious dispute arose as to the scope of the law. The insurance carriers and employer representatives contended that the law should be applied only to negotiated labor-management programs. I and representatives of labor unions contended, on the contrary, that it should be applied to all programs of the type, regardless of whether or not they resulted purely from negotiations.

The rules finally to be adopted by the Commissioner indicate his inclination to adopt the position of the insurance carriers and employer groups, and they should be effective some time soon as far as the registration of programs is concerned.

Because of the serious dispute as to the originally proposed annual statements and annual reports, the public hearing was confined simply to the registration procedures and no decision is currently being made as to the annual statements and reports.

"Right To Work"

State Building Trades

In accordance with the instructions of the Secretary, on December 14, 1957, at the invitation of the State Building Trades I attended their meeting in Fresno and reported fully as to the current status of the litigation involving the so-called local ordinances involving "right to work" and the contemplated program of the State Federation of Labor with respect to the proposed initiative on a statewide basis.

Statewide "Right to Work" Initiative

On January 11, 1958, I met in the offices of the Federation, together with a statewide committee of labor lawyers, to dis-

cuss the question of the titling of the proposed initiative. As a result of this meeting, on January 16, 1958, together with the Secretary-Treasurer, we conferred with Attorney General Brown and his deputies, presenting our viewpoints as to the proper titling of the document.

This was followed by numerous conferences with various interested parties with respect to the overall program of the statewide campaign and was thereafter followed, on January 25, 1958, by an all-day meeting in San Francisco at the Musicians Hall, at which time a full report was presented to the affiliates. Thereafter, I met with the officers of the Federation and other interested parties concerning generally the overall operation of the plan and negotiation of contracts covering such operation.

Conferences

Attorney General Conferences

On June 13, 1958, together with President Pitts and Secretary Haggerty, I met with Attorney General Brown, Chief Assistant Elkington and Special Advisor Goldstein with respect to the campaign being conducted by Special Advisor Goldstein insofar as the alleged investigation of unions in California was concerned. We explained in detail our willingness to cooperate, but also our firm conviction that the operation should be conducted in a fair and open manner.

Cole Conference

At the request of the representatives of the University of California, on May 19, 1958, I met with Mr. Ross and other labor-management representatives in San Francisco to confer with Mr. Cole, who was in the area on a special trip. He reviewed generally the industrial relations climate in the United States and in particular in San Francisco, no particular item of which requires special mention here.

Miscellaneous

Alameda Labor Conference, Monterey

On May 6, 1958, at the request of Vice President Ash, I appeared in Monterey before the meeting of this group to explain in detail the holding in the so-called Garmon case and its implications in future labor-management relations in California.

Arbitration Statute

At the request of the California Law

Revision Committee, I have been designated as a member of the State Bar Committee to assist the Law Revision Committee in the formulation of a revised Arbitration Statute in lieu of the proposed uniform Arbitration Statute.

Subsequent to such appointment, I have conferred with Mr. Kagel on June 25, 1958, with respect to a draft proposed by him and have given generally the viewpoints from labor's position with respect to the draft.

A meeting was held in San Francisco on September 4, 1958, between all members of the State Bar Committee and Mr. Kagel and members of the Law Revision Committee to review in detail the second revised draft in an attempt to obtain unanimity of opinion as to the approach. On October 9, 1958, together with Mr. Kagel, I appeared before the Law Revision Committee in San Diego.

You will recall that at the last session of the Legislature, an attempt was made to apply the uniform statute to labor relations, but we were successful in having labor exempted from the proposed statute, although it was not successfully enacted. It is essential that we watch this proposed legislation carefully in order that the beneficial aspects of arbitration in the field of industrial relations may not be hampered or destroyed.

Bakersfield Public Employees Ordinance

I have had numerous telephone conversations and exchange of correspondence with representatives of the Council and their attorney with respect to the proposed ordinance which would have seriously restricted the right of public employees to organize. As ultimately passed, it is my understanding that it is confined to public employees such as policemen and firemen but that the broader application has been restricted. To my knowledge, discussion of possible test of the ordinance was discussed but no further contact has been had with me since the enactment of the ordinance.

C & H Sugar Employees

At the request of the Secretary, during the month of June, 1958, I reviewed in detail certain proposed revisions in the collective bargaining agreement of the above organization and submitted my recommendations and comments to them.

Subsequently, on July 25, 1958, I conferred with Mr. Flanagan and Mr. Newman in regard to this matter, and again

on August 13, 1958, conferred with Mr. Flanagan. Finally, on August 29, 1958, I reviewed with Attorneys Bold and Faulkner, from the Association and the company, the various documents ensuing from the negotiations and submitted my comments to the interested parties.

Fishermen's Union

On June 6, 1958, I conferred with Messrs. Hawk and Weisberger and their attorney, Mr. Bodel, together with Secretary-Treasurer Haggerty and President Pitts, the problem encountered by the International as a result of the activities of Mr. Goldstein, the Special Investigator of the Attorney General's office. As a result of this conference, we indicated to the Attorney General our belief that his Special Assistant had operated in an improper manner in applying for court action without any attempt to obtain union compliance in advance, and we were assured that this would not occur again.

San Francisco Area Glazier Strike

On July 15, 1958, I conferred with representatives of the Glaziers, and particularly Mr. Kerr, Mr. Barthoff and Mr. German, with respect to the legal implications with which they were faced in the strike.

I explained the law to them in detail and the rights and liabilities that might flow from various courses of conduct. I received no further comment from them and accordingly assume that upon settlement of the strike they were adequately protected.

Monterey Peninsula Craftsmen

On February 27, 1958, I met in Monterey with representatives of both the Monterey and Salinas Building Trades Councils to discuss in detail with them the implication of the activities of the so-called company union group known as the "Peninsula Craftsmen." I explained to them their rights and liabilities under the law and have had no additional contact from them to date.

Conclusion

In addition to the above, I have followed out the instructions of the Secretary with respect to various requests for opinions and general advice submitted to me both orally and in writing by various affiliates and have made various appearances and speeches from time to time on varying subjects.

Report of Attorney Clarence E. Todd

Grocery Drivers No. 848 v. Seven Up Bottling Company of Los Angeles

Among the important cases in which the State Federation is now interested is the above matter, which has been in court since 1949 and has been referred to from time to time in former reports to the Federation.

In this case a suit was brought by the plaintiff employer for an injunction to prevent the union from organizing the employees and also for an injunction against picketing, primary or secondary, that is, picketing the employer or the customers of the employer, and also requesting damages.

The Supreme Court reversed the action of the lower court in regard to injunction against the defendants, but affirmed an award against the defendants of damages in the sum of \$4,000.

An appeal was taken by the union to the Supreme Court of the United States, which appeal is now pending.

Damato v. Associated Master Barbers

This was a suit by an employer barber against the association of master barbers and a local barbers' union.

The complaint alleged that the union and the association of master barbers were conspiring to fix prices. This employer barber was charging substantially less than the union price and paying less than the union wages. The union placed a picket upon him, peaceful in nature, although the plaintiff contrived to create altercations from time to time.

We objected to an injunction against picketing which was for the purpose of getting the plaintiff to charge the same rates for services and to pay the same wages for services as was done in union barber shops.

The Superior Court denied an injunction and the plaintiff took an appeal, which was dismissed when he failed to file his brief within the time permitted by the court.

Smith vs. Lathers (Los Angeles County)

Appeal was taken from the entry of judgment in this matter, but further action was not taken until we received authorization from the State Federation of Labor and from the local lather unions involved.

The last correspondence in our file indicates that in March, 1958, we wrote to Mr. Haggerty and Mr. Gariss for instructions concerning the further handling of this litigation, but to date no decision has been reached in the matter.

VI

RESEARCH AND PUBLICITY

1957 Labor Editors Conference

The Federation's eighth annual labor press conference was held on November 17-18 in San Diego with about 75 editors and trade union officials in attendance.

Keynote speaker at the annual banquet session was Gordon Cole, editor of "The Machinist" and a top figure in the U. S. labor press. In addition to his editor's role with the Machinists' Union, Cole is president of the International Labor Press Association.

All sessions were held in the Lafayette Hotel in San Diego.

The Saturday afternoon session was devoted exclusively to the "right to work" question. E. M. Weston, executive head of the merged Washington State Federation of Labor, reviewed techniques and procedures used by the Washington Labor movement in whipping a "right to work" initiative on the 1956 ballot by more than two to one.

Other speakers included Dr. Melvin Rothbaum, associate professor of economics, University of California at Los Angeles; Mrs. Mildred Brady, nationally known consumer education authority; Robert Rutland, professor of journalism and Curran Shields, professor of political science, both of the University of California at Los Angeles. Rutland headed discussions of newspaper makeup techniques and Shields surveyed motives and plans of America's anti-labor movement.

The annual labor editors conference was open to all AFL editors and trade union officials responsible for labor publications.

1957 Post-Convention Activities

Following the 1957 convention held September 16-20 in Oakland, the research department prepared the final proceedings of the convention and the officers' reports, a work of 471 pages; the final proceedings were then issued to all affiliates. For data on the mailing of convention resolutions, see the report of the secretary-treasurer. Twenty-one resolutions requiring local level action by the labor affiliates were

collected in the pamphlet "Therefore be it Resolved..."

Minimum Wage Brief

The State Federation of Labor filed a brief calling for the extension of the federal minimum wage-maximum hour law to agricultural workers and other employees not now covered, with the subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee on November 7, 1957, at a hearing held in San Francisco.

The brief noted the deplorable wage scale of agricultural workers in California and emphasized that all distinctions in coverage of workers were artificial and the result of political influence.

The State Federation took the position in the brief that if the present session of Congress failed to act on extension of the minimum wage-maximum hour law to farm workers, it would take the case to the International Labor Organization, an affiliate of the United Nations.

Prior to the hearing held in San Francisco, the State Federation had alerted all central councils in California of the scheduled hearings of the subcommittee, which also visited Oakland, San Jose, Salinas, San Diego and the Imperial Valley area.

Addresses and Debates Proposition 18

John F. Henning, research director, addressed the following organizations on behalf of the State Federation, relative to Proposition 18.

Alameda County Central Labor Council, Oakland
Shop Stewards, District Lodge 115, IAM, Oakland
Catholic College Alumni Society, University of San Francisco, San Francisco
San Francisco Theological Seminary (Presbyterian) San Anselmo.
Congregation Beth Shalom, San Francisco
Political Action Committee, San Francisco District Council of Carpenters, San Francisco
Sutter County Board of Supervisors, Yuba City
Carpenters Local No. 22, San Francisco
East Bay Labor Seminar, U. C. Institute of Industrial Relations, Oakland
San Mateo Junior College debate, San Mateo
Coppersmiths Local No. 438, San Francisco
Public Rally sponsored by Carpenters

Local No. 22, San Francisco
Hod Carriers and Laborers Local 291, San Rafael
Communication Workers of America, Oakland
California State Council of Lumber and Sawmill Workers, San Francisco
Public Rally, Monterey Central Labor Council and Monterey Building Trades Council, Monterey
City Council, Carmel
Unitarian Church, San Francisco
Teamsters Local No. 85, San Francisco
Sacramento-Yolo Building Trades Council, Sacramento
Western Conference of Laundry Workers, San Francisco
Solano Central Labor Council, Vallejo
Sheet Metal Workers Union, Oakland
Waitresses Local 31, Oakland
Plumbers and Steamfitters Local 467, San Mateo
San Francisco Labor Seminar, U. C. Institute of Industrial Relations, San Francisco
Faculty Members, University of California, Berkeley
Public Rally, Retail Clerks Local 373, Vallejo
Carpenters Local No. 1622, Hayward
Negro Cultural and Historical Society, San Francisco
Marine Cooks & Stewards Union, San Francisco
Butchers Local 120, Oakland
Public Rally, Marin County Central Labor Council, Greenbrae
American Library Association Convention debate, San Francisco
Public Rally, San Mateo Central Labor Council, Tanforan
Western Hospital Association Conference, San Francisco
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen Executive Board for Northern California, San Francisco.
Public Relations Class, University of San Francisco Labor-Management School, San Francisco
Rotary Club, Mountain View
International Association of Machinists Lodge 732, San Francisco
Newman Club, University of California, Berkeley
St. Patrick's Seminary, Menlo Park
Political Science Class, Stanford University
Rotary Club, Pleasant Hills, Contra Costa County
San Francisco Federal Business Association, San Francisco
San Francisco Carpenters Unions, San Francisco
Musicians Local No. 6, San Francisco

Encampment of Citizens (Youth Group)
 University of California, Berkeley
 Kiwanis Club, debate, San Mateo
 Young Christian Workers, Asilomar
 Rotary Club, debate, San Jose
 Public Affairs Committee, San Francisco
 Junior Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco
 Teamsters Local No. 278, San Francisco
 Veterans Political Council, debate, San Francisco
 Industrial Relations Section, Commonwealth Club, San Francisco
 Men's Club, debate, Congregational Church, San Mateo
 Laborers Local No. 304, Oakland
 Industrial Relations Class, Stanford University
 Television debate, KPIX, San Francisco
 San Francisco State College, debate, San Francisco
 San Francisco Women's College, debate, San Francisco
 Northern California Insurance Association, debate, San Francisco
 Fire Fighters Local No. 798, San Francisco
 Marin County Real Estate Board, San Rafael
 Public Rally, Sonoma County Labor Movement, Santa Rosa
 League of Women Voters, debate, Stockton
 San Mateo County Business Agents, San Mateo
 State Convention, Democratic Party, Sacramento
 State Convention, Republican Party, Sacramento.

Scholarship Contest

The California State Federation of Labor's 1958 high school scholarship contest found two boys and one girl winning the 8th annual competition in which three \$500 scholarships are awarded by the Federation.

This year's winners are: John L. Dolan, Hillsdale High School, San Mateo; John F. Peterson, St. Ignatius High School, San Francisco, and Barbara Woth, Relands High School, Redlands.

The annual competition is open to all senior high school students in California and Hawaii. This year 336 students from 153 schools in California and Hawaii participated. The written examination was held June 9.

The committee of judges which selected the winners was composed of three professional educators: Frederick A. Breier, Assistant Professor of Economics, University of San Francisco; Vaughn D. Seidel, Ala-

meda County Superintendent of Schools, Oakland; and Arthur Carstens, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Los Angeles.

The three 1958 winners will be presented their awards at the December 8-13 Convention in San Francisco.

Political Pamphlets

More than 1,000,000 pamphlets carrying the political recommendations of the California Labor League for Political Education, AFL, were distributed throughout the state, prior to the general election of November 4.

About 750,000 endorsement pamphlets were distributed prior to the primary election of June 3.

In addition to a slate of endorsed statewide candidates headed by Edmund G. Brown (D) for Governor and Glenn M. Anderson (D) for Lieutenant Governor, the pamphlets included recommendations in 30 Congressional contests, 20 state Senatorial races up this year, and 80 state Assembly seats, as well as the four State Board of Equalization districts.

The pamphlets also carried the recommendations of the California State Federation of Labor on the 18 state propositions which appeared on the November ballot.

Because of the large number of endorsements and recommendations involved, the CLLPE issued separate pamphlets for nine areas in the state, as follows: Alameda County, Central San Joaquin Valley, Los Angeles County, Sacramento Valley, Solano and Contra Costa Counties, San Diego County, San Francisco County, San Mateo County and Santa Clara County.

These area pamphlets carried, besides statewide candidates and recommendations on ballot propositions, only the district recommendations for political offices in the particular areas. A general pamphlet containing all endorsements and recommendations of the CLLPE was sent out in all other areas outside the nine listed above.

Distribution to the membership was made by affiliated unions, leagues and councils.

1958 Labor Press Conference

The State Federation's ninth annual labor press conference was held on November 22-23 in Monterey.

Keynote speaker at the annual banquet session was Dr. Peter Odegard of the Department of Political Science of the Uni-

versity of California in Berkeley. His topic was "What the Russians are Told." Dr. Odegard described his experience as a member of a U. S. State Department team which visited Russia this summer.

The 1958 election returns were thoroughly reviewed by Dr. Irving Bernstein of the Institute of Industrial Relations of the University of California in Los Angeles, and Hal Dunleavy, San Francisco political pollster.

The continuing problem of racketeers in the field of labor press advertising were reviewed in a panel headed by R. L. Burgess, editor of the East Bay Labor Journal in Oakland, and Lloyd Smith, advertising representative of the Olympic Press in Oakland.

The state AFL president, Thomas L. Pitts, surveyed state legislative prospects. He assured delegates that the State Federation would be happy to work out labor press coverage problems of the 1959 session in Sacramento.

Legal and editorial aspects of "retraction" in the press were discussed by Albert G. Pickerill of the Department of Journalism of the University of California in Berkeley.

Dr. Odegard, in a second talk, gave an analysis of the 1958 election implications.

Proposition 18

The State Federation Research Department devoted several months to preparing the material and services used in the campaign against Proposition 18.

Among the many materials prepared in the State Federation office were:

"Legal Analysis of Proposition 18": 920,000 copies distributed; "The 'Right to Work' Fraud": 600,000 copies distributed; "A Moral Look at 'Right to Work'," presenting the views of three major religious figures: 600,000 distributed; "Speakers' Manual on 'Right to Work'": 1,500 copies distributed; "Businessmen's Pamphlet": 193,000 copies distributed; Spanish language pamphlet on Proposition 18: 105,000 copies distributed.

In addition, the State Federation gave local application to pamphlets printed by the national AFL-CIO headquarters and other sources.

The Research Department worked virtually as one organization with Gross and Roberts, the advertising firm directing the statewide campaign against Proposition 18.

The Research Department staff mem-

bers made innumerable talks and presentations before community groups.

For a full report on the State Federation campaign against Proposition 18, see Part IV of this report by the secretary-treasurer.

Tax Statement

The Research Department prepared a statement on tax and revenue problems for submission to the state legislature's joint interim tax committee at hearings held in Los Angeles on May 26-27, 1958.

Proposition 17

The Research Department prepared an analysis of Proposition 17, the State Federation-backed tax revision initiative on the November ballot for submission to the Joint Interim Committee of the California Legislature at hearings held July 7 in San Francisco.

Later, copies of the analysis were distributed to Democratic and Republican party conventions, to members of the state legislature, labor press and interested community groups.

The department also prepared a pamphlet on the proposition, and John F. Henning and Don Vial spoke before various public groups on the merits of the proposal.

Statements

The Research Department prepared a statement in support of federal construction of the San Luis Project in strict compliance with national reclamation law for submission to the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at hearings in Washington, D. C., on March 17 and 18, 1958.

The department also prepared a statement on the extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act for submission to the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor at hearings held in San Francisco, November 7, 1957.

Also prepared by the department was a statement in support of the excess lands provision in reclamation law, submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation at hearings held in Washington, D. C., April 30, 1958.

Additionally, the department prepared similar reports for numerous other state and federal agencies of government.

VII

"WE DON'T PATRONIZE" LIST

Relatively few changes were made in the Federation's "We Don't Patronize" list since it was reported by your secretary to the Federation's 1957 convention.

Morrison & Jackson Lumber Company, Myers Flat

At its meeting on the eve of the September 1957 convention, the executive council considered a request submitted by Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2952 of Myers Flat and the California State Council of Lumber and Sawmill Workers to place the Morrison & Jackson Lumber Company of Myers Flat on the Federation's "We Don't Patronize" list. The council placed the matter in the hands of your secretary pending an attempt to bring about a settlement of the dispute, and authorized him to place the firm on our unfair list should this fail. Our efforts were not successful, and the Morrison & Jackson Lumber Company was accordingly placed on the "We Don't Patronize" list on October 8, 1957.

Becker Bookbinding Company, San Diego

At the same meeting in September, 1957, the executive council removed the Becker Bookbinding Company of San Diego from the unfair list on the request of Bookbinders No. 40, San Diego, whose secretary reported that the union's strike against this company had been successfully concluded. The San Diego Central Labor Council had also advised us of the settlement.

Nichols News Company, Modesto

Upon notification by Teamsters No. 386 of Modesto that the Nichols News Company was under new management and that the dispute between the union and this company had been successfully adjusted, the executive council at the same September 1957 meeting, removed the Nichols News Company from the unfair list.

Pen and Quill Restaurant, Manhattan Beach

By action of the 1957 convention, the Pen and Quill Restaurant, located in Manhattan Beach, Los Angeles County, was placed on the unfair list. This action was requested by the Local Joint Executive Board of Waitresses, Bartenders, Culinary and Hotel Service Workers of San Pedro.

Arrowhead-Puritas Water Company, Los Angeles

The Arrowhead-Puritas Water Company of Los Angeles was placed on the "We Don't Patronize" list at the executive council's meeting in August, 1957, following similar action by the Los Angeles Central Labor Council acting upon a request by Operating Engineers No. 501 of Los Angeles.

Current "We Don't Patronize" List

The following is the official "We Don't Patronize" list of the California State Federation of Labor as revised by the executive council at its quarterly meeting in August, 1958:

Bakeries—

Helms Bakery.

Cosmetics, etc.—

Andrew Jergens Products.

Dairy Products—

Cache Valley Dairymen's Association, Smithfield, Utah, "Rocky Mountain Dairy Products."

Laundries—

Southern Service Company, Ltd., owning and operating the following:

Anaheim

Anaheim Laundry
Orange County Linen Supply.

Colton

Hub City.

Long Beach

Ideal Laundry
Long Beach Laundry
Pacific Cleaners
Long Beach Linen Supply.

Los Angeles

Blue Seal Laundry
Blue Seal Linen Supply
Blue Bird Laundry
Blue Bird Cleaners.

Monrovia

Monrovia Laundry
Monrovia Cleaners
Blue Seal Linen Supply.

Ontario

Ontario Laundry.

Pomona

Sanitary Laundry
Sanitary Cleaners.

Riverside

Riverside Laundry.

San Bernardino

San Bernardino Laundry
Valley Towel and Linen Supply.

San Diego

Electric Laundry
Munger's Laundry
Nu-Way Laundry
Peerless Laundry
Bay City Linen Supply
Benbough and Duggan.

San Pedro

Pacific Laundry.

Santa Ana

Santa Ana Laundry
Crescent Cleaners.

Wilmington

Marine Laundry.

Lumber and Lumber Products—

Alpine Lumber Company.
Dorris Lumber and Moulding Company,
Sacramento.
El Dorado County Forest Products, El
Dorado.
Morrison & Jackson Lumber Company,
Myers Flat.
Pres-to-Logs Distributors of California,
Sacramento.
E. F. Quiran and Sons, Porterville.
Rembac's Blockyard, Visalia.
State Box Company, Sacramento.

Magazine Distributors—

Davinroy News Company, Stockton.
Spangler's News Agency, Sacramento.

Manufacturing—

Glendale Sheet Metal and Manufactur-
ing Company, Glendale.

Newspapers—

Los Angeles Times.
Los Angeles Mirror-Daily News.

Paint—

E. I. DuPont de Nemours Company
(Duco-Dulux enamels, paints, varnish-
es, lacquers, and marine finishes).

Plumbing Ware—

The Kohler Company, Kohler, Wiscon-
sin.

Printers and Publishers—

Curtis Company, Philadelphia (includes
Saturday Evening Post, Ladies' Home
Journal, Country Gentleman, and Hol-
iday).

Restaurants and Coffee Shops—

Lawry's Prime Rib Restaurant and all
Lawry Products, Los Angeles.
Stears Restaurant, Los Angeles.
Richlor's Cafe, Los Angeles.
Country Maid, Sacramento.
Pen and Quill Restaurant, Manhattan
Beach.

Roofing Companies—

Lloyd A. Fry Roofing Company, San
Leandro.

Water Companies—

Arrowhead - Puritas Water Company,
Los Angeles.

VIII**STATE FEDERATION MEMBERSHIP STATISTICS**

	Local Unions Affiliated	Councils Affiliated	Total Affiliations	Toal Membership
October 1, 1909.....	151.....	11.....	162.....	25,000
October 1, 1910.....	244.....	12.....	256.....	45,000
October 1, 1911.....	362.....	12.....	374.....	56,000
October 1, 1912.....	429.....	15.....	444.....	62,000
October 1, 1913.....	502.....	15.....	517.....	67,000
October 1, 1914.....	512.....	18.....	530.....	69,000
October 1, 1915.....	498.....	18.....	516.....	66,500
October 1, 1916.....	481.....	21.....	502.....	68,000
October 1, 1917.....	498.....	21.....	519.....	71,500
October 1, 1918.....	486.....	21.....	507.....	78,000
October 1, 1919.....	515.....	24.....	539.....	94,900
October 1, 1920.....	549.....	27.....	576.....	104,200
October 1, 1921.....	568.....	27.....	595.....	100,100
October 1, 1922.....	664.....	27.....	691.....	91,000
September 1, 1923.....	626.....	26.....	651.....	87,500
September 1, 1924.....	633.....	25.....	658.....	92,000
September 1, 1925.....	607.....	25.....	652.....	95,400
September 1, 1926.....	662.....	27.....	689.....	96,600
September 1, 1927.....	648.....	28.....	676.....	95,200
September 1, 1928.....	647.....	30.....	677.....	96,100

STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

129

September 1, 1929.....	623.....	32.....	655.....	99,000
September 1, 1930.....	627.....	32.....	659.....	100,200
September 1, 1931.....	648.....	34.....	682.....	99,400
September 1, 1932.....	628.....	32.....	660.....	91,200
September 1, 1933.....	564.....	28.....	592.....	82,100
September 1, 1934.....	580.....	32.....	612.....	91,900
September 1, 1935.....	619.....	29.....	648.....	102,000
September 1, 1936.....	622.....	32.....	654.....	135,179
September 1, 1937.....	740.....	35.....	775.....	235,911
September 1, 1938.....	854.....	39.....	893.....	291,763
September 1, 1939.....	915.....	39.....	954.....	267,401
September 1, 1940.....	987.....	42.....	1029.....	274,901
September 1, 1941.....	917.....	44.....	961.....	332,635
September 1, 1942.....	1050.....	53.....	1103.....	451,970
September 1, 1943.....	1003.....	72.....	1075.....	510,477
August 1, 1944.....	1040.....	78.....	1118.....	521,356
August 1, 1945.....	1131.....	106.....	1237.....	514,239
June 1, 1946.....	1113.....	108.....	1221.....	510,596
July 1, 1947.....	1149.....	116.....	1265.....	520,841
July 1, 1948.....	1201.....	127.....	1328.....	573,466
July 1, 1949.....	1236.....	131.....	1367.....	592,559
July 1, 1950.....	1295.....	137.....	1432.....	586,789
July 1, 1951.....	1374.....	144.....	1518.....	602,302
July 1, 1952.....	1392.....	147.....	1539.....	625,807
June 1, 1953.....	1354.....	155.....	1509.....	646,569
July 1, 1954.....	1376.....	156.....	1532.....	664,698
July 1, 1955.....	1344.....	157.....	1501.....	689,856
July 1, 1956.....	1334.....	162.....	1496.....	720,439
July 1, 1957.....	1381.....	164.....	1545.....	825,163
September 30, 1958.....	1275.....	161.....	1436.....	749,423

NEW LOCAL AND COUNCIL AFFILIATIONS

July 1, 1957 to September 30, 1958

Town	Name of Local	Local No.	Date	Members
Alhambra				
	Chiropractic Professional	362	3/20/58	28
Arcata				
	Plywood & Veneer Workers	2789	9/ 5 /57	360
Bakersfield				
	Fire Fighters Association	1301	5/27/58	45
	Machinists	5	12/ 2 /57	111
	Retail Clerks	137	9/30/57	700
Barstow				
	Local Federation Railway Employees	—	10/21/57	—
Bijou				
	Carpenters	1789	8/ 5 /57	162
Bishop				
	Production, Construction & General Laborers	302	11/ 5 /57	108
Camino				
	Lumber & Saw Mill Workers	2749	8/ 9 /57	153
Culver City				
	Stove Mounters (re-affiliated)	68	2/15/58	200
Edwards				
	Government Employees	1406	12/16/57	200

El Centro			
Carpenters & Joiners	1070	11/15/57	215
Eureka			
Plywood & Veneer Workers	2931	10/10/57	276
Fontana			
Fire Fighters Association	1274	9/ 2 /57	26
Fresno			
Machinists	653	7/ 1 /57	800
Machinists	1309	7/ 5 /57	900
Hollywood			
Machinists, Air Transport Lodge	2039	3/15/58	159
Huntington Park			
Chiropractic Professional	365	4/18/58	23
Machinists	1571	12/16/57	589
Long Beach			
Machinists	1235	3/ 5 /58	225
Sheet Metal Workers	420	9/ 6 /57	500
Los Angeles			
Calif. State Association of Letter Carriers	—	5/20/58	—
Ladies Garment Workers	483	11/15/57	200
Machinists District Council	94	2/26/58	—
Pari-Mutuel Employees Guild	280	4/13/58	300
So. California Joint Council No. 8			
Building Service Employees	—	11/19/57	—
So. California Printing Spec. & Paper			
Products Joint Council No. 2	—	8/30/57	—
Los Banos			
Carpenters	539	9/12/57	50
Marysville			
Automotive Machinists	1887	11/19/57	56
Maywood			
Machinists	795	2/ 3 /58	500
Modesto			
Building Service Employees	415	11/12/57	25
Fire Fighters	1289	1/ 3 /58	35
Oakland			
Machinists, Air Craft Workers	854	12/13/57	1500
Plasterers	112	8/21/57	200
Omo Ranch			
Carpenters	2728	10/10/57	125
Ontario			
Machinists	821	11/20/57	50
Orange			
General Truck Drivers & Warehousemen	235	7/12/57	400
Oxnard			
Carpenters	2042	1/22/58	271
Palmdale			
Typographical	852	10/ 4 /57	13
Pomona			
Chiropractic Professional	363	4/18/58	24
General Teamsters, Sales Drivers	871	8/12/57	500
Machinists	1586	11/ 6 /57	457

STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

131

Redding			
Laundry & Dry Cleaning Workers	92	11/19/57	173
Richmond			
Operative Potters	302	12/20/57	42
Riverside			
Machinists	1104	11/22/57	500
Roseville			
Carpenters	1147	4/29/58	395
Sacramento			
Iron Workers (Shopmen)	504	9/25/57	155
Printing Spec. & Paper Converters	460	2/26/58	100
Rocket & Guided Missile-Machinist	946	11/23/57	2907
Salinas			
Fire Fighters Association	1270	6/27/57	35
San Andreas			
Carpenters	386	8/30/57	60
San Bernardino			
Electrical Workers	543	1/27/58	200
Millwright & Machinery Erectors	1113	9/ 2 /57	206
Musicians Association	167	4/29/58	100
San Diego			
Machinists, District Council	50	11/12/57	—
Newspaper Printing Pressmen	48	3/11/58	56
San Francisco			
Carpenters	22	11/23/57	2500
Public Employees Conference (re-affiliated)	—	8/23/57	—
San Gabriel			
Machinists	1542	12/12/57	274
San Jose			
Glass Bottle Blowers	267	2/ 7 /58	48
San Luis Obispo			
Carpenters	1632	10/23/57	200
San Mateo			
Hod Carriers & Common Laborers	97	12/ 4 /57	100
Santa Ana			
Chiropractic Professional	364	3/28/58	23
Glass Bottle Blowers	228	1/16/58	20
Glass Bottle Blowers	263	9/25/57	155
Musicians Association	7	5/12/58	100
Santa Maria			
Construction, General & Oil Field Laborers	1222	10/ 5 /57	441
Santa Monica			
Retail Clerks	1442	7/30/57	1041
Stockton			
Machinists	364	12/14/57	1100
Susanville			
Lumber & Saw Mill Workers	3033	7/25/57	230
Tuolumne			
Lumber & Saw Mill Workers	2810	10/29/57	438

Ventura			
District Council of Carpenters	—	1/28/58	—
Watsonville			
Fire Fighters Association	1272	6/27/57	10
West Point			
Lumber & Saw Mill Workers	2694	8/22/57	196
White Pines			
Lumber & Saw Mill Workers	2538	11/ 8 /57	142
Wilmington			
Inland Boatmen's Union of Pacific		8/21/57	195
El Centro			
Musicians Union	347	8/19/58	75
Hollywood			
Script Supervisors	871	6/28/58	106
Teachers	1323	8/ 7 /58	37
Oakland			
Machinists Council	115	8/ 1 /58	—
Redwood City			
Electrical Workers	1969	8/25/58	750
Richmond			
Machinists	824	9/ 6 /58	1750
San Diego			
Machinists	2191	6/28/58	2067
Machinists	2192	6/28/58	2530
Machinists	2193	6/28/58	1536
Machinists	2194	6/28/58	1437
Machinists	2195	6/28/58	3167
Machinists	2196	6/28/58	1311
Southgate			
Fire Fighters Association	810	8/28/58	46
Taft			
Carpenters	1774	9/ 2 /58	37
Vallejo			
Machinists	1492	9/10/58	200
Total: 91; 82 locals; 9 councils.			

LOCAL UNIONS AND COUNCILS—SUSPENDED BY AFL-CIO.

LETTER, 5/29/58

Los Angeles

Joint Council of Teamsters No. 42.
Western Warehouse & Produce Council.

Oakland

Calif. State Council of Cannery Workers.

San Francisco

Joint Executive Council of Teamsters No. 7.

Antioch

Cannery Workers & Warehousemen No. 678.

Bakersfield

Teamsters, Chauffeurs & Helpers No. 87.

El Centro

Truck Drivers, Warehousemen & Helpers No. 898.

Eureka

Teamsters, Warehousemen & Auto Truck Drivers No. 684.

Fresno

Creamery Employees & Drivers No. 517.

General Teamsters No. 431.

Packing House Empl. & Warehousemen No. 616.

Hayward

Cannery, Warehousemen & Food Processors No. 768.

Hollywood

Studio Transportation Drivers No. 399.

Kingsburg

Cannery, Warehousemen, Food Processors No. 746.

Lancaster

General Teamsters No. 982.

Long Beach

Automotive Employees & Laundry Drivers No. 88.

Chauffeurs, Sales Drivers No. 572.

General Truck Drivers, Chauffeurs etc. No. 692.

Los Angeles

Auto Park & Parking Garage Employees No. 62.

Bakery Drivers No. 276.

Beer Drivers & Helpers No. 203.

Building Material & Dump Truck Drivers No. 420.

Dairy Employees, Plant & Clerical No. 93.

Food, Drug, Beverage Warehousemen & Clerical Employees No. 595.

Food Processors, Packers, Warehousemen & Clerical No. 547.

Freight Handlers, Clerks No. 357.

Fruit, Produce Drivers & Warehousemen No. 630.

Hay Haulers, Dairy Employees No. 737.

Ice Drivers & Cold Storage Warehousemen No. 942.

Laundry & Line Supply & Dry Cleaning Drivers No. 928.

Line Drivers No. 224.

Local Freight Drivers No. 208.

Meat & Provision Drivers No. 626.

Municipal Truck Drivers No. 403.

New Furniture & Appliance Drivers No. 196.

Package & General Utilities Drivers No. 396.

Retail Milk Drivers No. 441.

Steel, Paper House Chemical Drivers No. 578.

Teamsters Automotive Workers No. 495.

Van & Storage Drivers No. 389.

Wholesale Dairy & Ice Cream Drivers No. 306.

Wholesale Delivery Drivers No. 848.

Martinez

General Truck Drivers No. 315.

Marysville

General Teamsters No. 137.

Modesto

Cannery Warehousemen & Food Processors, Drivers No. 748.

Chauffeurs, Teamsters No. 386.

Packing House Employees & Warehousemen No. 698.

Napa

Packing House Employees & Warehousemen No. 668.

Oakland

Bakery Wagon Drivers No. 432.
Cannery Warehousemen, Food Processors, Drivers, etc. No. 750.
Chauffeurs No. 923.
General Warehousemen No. 853.
Milk Drivers & Dairy Employees No. 302.
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers No. 96.
Retail Delivery Drivers, Salesmen & Produce Drivers No. 588.
Teamsters Union No. 70.
Teamsters Automotive Employees No. 78.

Orange

General Truck Drivers No. 235.
Sales Drivers, Food Processors & Warehousemen No. 952.

Oroville

Cannery, Dried Fruit & Nut Workers No. 849.

Pomona

General Teamsters, Sales Drivers & Food Processors No. 871.

Redwood City

General Warehousemen & Food Processors No. 655.

Sacramento

Cannery Workers & Warehousemen No. 857.
Chauffeurs, Teamsters & Helpers No. 150.
Laundry & Cleaning Drivers No. 234.
Teamsters, Automotive & Chauffeurs No. 165.

Salinas

General Teamsters & Warehousemen No. 890.

San Bernardino

General Truck Drivers No. 467.
Sales Drivers & Dairy Employees No. 166.

San Diego

Building Materials & Dump Truck Drivers No. 36.
Chauffeurs, Garage & Automotive Employees No. 481.
Sales Drivers & Dairy Employees No. 683.
Teamsters, Chauffeurs & Warehousemen No. 542.

San Francisco

Automobile Drivers & Demonstrators No. 960.
Automotive Warehousemen No. 241.
Bakery Wagon Drivers & Salesmen No. 484.
Bottlers No. 896.
Brewery Drivers No. 888.
Brewers, Maltsters & Yeast Workers No. 893.
Brewery, Soda & Mineral Water Packers, etc. No. 884.
Building Material & Construction Teamsters No. 216.
Chauffeurs No. 265.
Commission Market Drivers No. 280.
Garage Employees No. 665.
General Warehousemen No. 860.
Ice Wagon Drivers & Helpers No. 440.
Laundry Wagon Drivers No. 256.
Milk Wagon Drivers No. 226.
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers No. 921.
Retail Delivery Drivers No. 278.
Sanitary Truck Drivers No. 350.
Teamsters No. 85.
Warehousemen No. 12.
Wholesale Liquor Drivers & Salesmen No. 109.

San Jose

Freight, Construction & General Drivers No. 287.
Sales Delivery Drivers & Warehousemen No. 296.
Teamsters Automotive Workers No. 576.
Cannery Workers, Warehousemen F.P. & Drivers No. 679.

San Rafael

General Truck Drivers No. 624.

Santa Barbara

Chauffeurs, Teamsters No. 186.

Santa Maria

Food Packers, Processors & Warehousemen No. 865.
Teamsters No. 381.

Santa Rosa

General Truck Drivers & Warehousemen No. 980.

Stockton

Cannery, Warehousemen, Food Processors No. 601.
Chauffeurs & Teamsters No. 439.

Vallejo

Teamsters & Chauffeurs No. 490.

Visalia

Teamsters No. 94.

Watsonville

General Teamsters Packers, F.P. & Warehousemen No. 912.

Oakland

Pacific Coast Conference of Bakers & Confectionery Workers.

Los Angeles

Joint Executive Board of Bakers & Confectionery Workers.
Bakers No. 37.
Bakers No. 400.

Oakland

Bakers No. 119.
Candy & Confectionery Workers No. 444.

Sacramento

Bakers & Confectionery Workers No. 85.

San Diego

Bakers No. 315.
Joint Council No. 2, Laundry Workers.

Fresno

Laundry Workers No. 86.

Long Beach

Cleaning & Dye House Workers No. 36.

Los Angeles

Cleaners & Dye House Workers No. 11.
Laundry & Dry Cleaning Workers No. 52.

Redding

Laundry Workers No. 92.

Sacramento

Laundry & Dry Cleaning Workers No. 75.

San Bernardino

Laundry Workers No. 186.

San Diego

Laundry & Dry Cleaning Workers No. 259.

San Francisco

Laundry Workers No. 26.

San Jose

Laundry Workers No. 33.

Vallejo

Laundry Workers No. 113.

Total: 127; 120 locals; 7 councils.

SUSPENDED—NON-PAYMENT PER CAPITA**Agnew**

California State Employees No. 247.

Albany

Teachers Union No. 1304.

Auburn

Lumber & Saw Mill Workers No. 2687.

Bakersfield

Street, Electric Railway & M.C. Operators No. 1291.

Berkeley

Municipal Employees No. 390.

El Monte

Horseshoers No. 17.

Fortuna

Carpenters & Joiners No. 960.

Ione

Glass Bottle Blowers No. 80.

Long Beach

Boilermakers No. L-285.

Los Angeles

Brick & Clay Workers No. 661.

Elevator Operators & Starters No. 217.

Firemen & Oilers No. 152.

Government Employees No. 1167.

Paint Makers No. 1232.

Watchmakers No. 115.

Lynwood

Teachers No. 1294.

Myers Flat

Lumber & Saw Mill Workers No. 2952.

Pasadena

Barbers No. 603.

Printing Pressmen No. 155.

Pomona

Operative Potters No. 199.

Richmond

Fish Cannery Workers of the Pacific.

San Bernardino

Teachers No. 832.

San Diego

Barbers No. 256.

San Francisco

Ornamental Plasterers No. 460.

Wood Wire & Metal Lathers No. 65.

San Luis Obispo

Construction & General Laborers No. 1464.

Santa Monica

Central Labor Council.

Plasterers & Cement Masons No. 400.

Ukiah

Central Labor Council.

Venice

Bricklayers & Stone Masons No. 26.

Visalia

Plasterers & Cement Masons No. 895.

Warm Springs

Brick & Clay Workers No. 663.

Westwood

District Council of Lumber & Saw Mill Workers of Northern California.

Total: 33; 30 locals; 3 councils.

WITHDRAWALS, MERGERS, DISBANDED, REVOKED, ETC.

July 1, 1957 to July 1, 1958

Cazadero

Lumber & Saw Mill Workers No. 2558, merged with No. 2882, 1/28/58.

Glendale

Culinary Workers No. 324, merged with No. 531, 4/1/58.

Klamath

Plywood Workers No. 2792, charter returned, 1/7/58.

Long Beach

United Garment Workers No. 56, withdrew, 5/3/58.

Los Angeles

Building Service Employees No. 76, out of existence, 3/10/58.

Operative Potters No. 183, withdrew, 2/26/58.

Stove Mounters No. 125, withdrew, 1/16/58.

Madera

Carpenters & Joiners No. 2189, withdrew, 11/4/57.

Modesto

Painters No. 317, withdrew, 12/23/57.

Montebello

Fire Fighters No. 1193, merged with No. 1014, 9/3/57.

Oakland

Federal Fire Fighters, Naval Supply, defunct, 1/3/58.

Pomona

Glass Bottle Blowers No. 232, merged with No. 34.

Richmond

Firemen & Oilers No. 972, withdrew, 9/7/57.

Roseville

Railway Carmen No. 231, withdrew, 1/1/58.

San Francisco

Emergency Hospital Employees No. 803, withdrew 11/16/57.
Retail Cigar & Liquor Clerks No. 1089, merged with No. 648.
Treasure Island Fire Fighters, defunct, 1/3/58.

San Mateo

Shinglers No. 3111, dissolved, 4/2/58.

San Pedro

Joint Board Culinary Workers, withdrew, 8/19/57.

Santa Rosa

Fire Fighters No. 1050, defunct, 5/2/58.

Sawtelle

Federal Fire Fighters No. 16, defunct, 2/6/58.

Sebastopol

Cannery, Food Processors Warehousemen No. 22, merged with No. 980.

Ontario

Machinists No. 120, withdrew membership, 6/18/58.

Alhambra

Chiropractic Professional No. 362, suspended by AFL-CIO.

Castro Valley

Federal Fire Fighters of Oak Knoll, charter suspended.

Huntington Park

Chiropractic Professional No. 365, suspended by AFL-CIO.

Los Angeles

Glass Bottle Blowers No. 208, merged with No. 148.

Oakland

Welders & Burners No. 10, merged with Boilermakers No. 10.

Petaluma

Central Labor Council, merged with C.L.C., Santa Rosa.

Pomona

Chiropractic Professional No. 363, suspended by AFL-CIO.

Red Bluff

Lumber & Saw Mill Workers No. 2850, merged with No. 1608, Redding.

Riverside

Chiropractic Professional No. 359, suspended by AFL-CIO.
City Employees No. 395, disbanded.

Sacramento

Lumber & Saw Mill Workers No. 3170, membership withdrawn.

San Gabriel

Machinists No. 1542, disbanded.

San Leandro

Teachers No. 1285, membership withdrawn.

San Mateo

Typographical Union No. 624, merged with San Francisco No. 21.

Santa Ana

Chiropractic Professional No. 364, suspended by AFL-CIO.

Stockton

Bakers Union No. 120, membership withdrawn.

Total: 39; mergers: 1 council, 10 locals; withdrawn, suspended, etc.: 28 locals.

SUMMARY OF MEMBERSHIP, 1957-1958

Labor Unions in good standing, 7/1/57	1381	
Labor Councils in good standing, 7/1/57	164	
TOTAL		1545
Labor Unions affiliated during year	82	
Labor Councils affiliated during year	9	
TOTAL		91
WITHDRAWALS DURING YEAR		
Mergers:		
Labor Unions	10	
Councils	1	
Suspended by AFL-CIO (Teamsters, Bakers, Laundry Workers):		
Labor Unions	121	
Councils	7	
Withdrawals, suspensions, etc.:		
Labor Unions	57	
Councils	4	
TOTAL		200
Total Affiliations as of 9/30/58		
Labor Unions	1275	
Labor Councils	161	
TOTAL		1436

IX**REPORT OF THE AUDITORS**

San Francisco, California
July 16, 1958

California State Federation of Labor
995 Market Street
San Francisco, California

Gentlemen:

We have examined the Statement of Cash Balances of California State Federation of Labor as of June 30, 1958, and the related Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements for the fiscal year then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

Cash receipts, as recorded and evidenced by duplicate receipts on file, were found to have been deposited regularly in the Federation's commercial bank account with Bank of America N.T. & S.A. Disbursements from this account were evidenced by paid checks on file, which we compared to the register of checks drawn as to payees and amounts, and scrutinized as to signatures and endorsements. Disbursements were found to be either supported by voucher, or approved for payment by Mr. C. J. Haggerty, Secretary-Treasurer. The classification as to detail of disbursements contained in this report has been compiled from information furnished by employees of the Federation.

The commercial account with Bank of America N.T. & S.A. was reconciled with the bank's statements on file for the year ended June 30, 1958. Balances on deposit in commercial and savings accounts were confirmed by correspondence with the depositaries.

The office cash fund was counted and found to be in order.

In August 1957, United States Savings Bonds, Series F, costing \$33,300.00, were redeemed for \$45,000.00. The difference between the cost and maturity value, amount-

ing to \$11,700.00 and representing interest earned on the bonds, was credited to the Organizing Fund. These bonds were the final maturities of a series of investments by the Federation in United States Savings Bonds.

During the month of October 1957, the California State Federation of Labor entered into a contract with Occidental Life Insurance Company, whereby that company would, henceforth, act as the depositary and administrator of the Federation's pension program. The program provides for pension benefits, in the form of individual annuities, for qualified, full-time employees and full-time paid officers of the Federation. Under the terms of the contract, covered employees become eligible for normal retirement benefits after having attained age sixty and after having completed twenty years of continuous service with the Federation. In addition, provision has been made in the contract for employees whose employment is terminated after having completed ten years of continuous service, and for employees who become totally and permanently disabled after having completed fifteen years of continuous service. The following information, which relates to funds deposited by the Federation with the Occidental Life Insurance Company, was confirmed to us by the insurance company at June 30, 1958:

Deposit made during October 1957 from Federation's Pension Fund.....	\$275,548.16
Additional deposits made during December 1957 from Federation's Operating Funds	12,651.22
	<u>\$288,199.38</u>
Less: Administration fee deducted	300.00
	<u>\$287,899.38</u>
Add: Interest earned to June 30, 1958.....	4,646.87
Balance in Deposit Accumulation Fund with Occidental Life Insurance Company at June 30, 1958	<u>\$292,546.25</u>

We have been advised that a request has been submitted by the Federation to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for a ruling on the income tax status of the pension program.

In July 1957 the "Right to Work" Defense Fund was established to provide funds for the campaign against anti-union legislation. The Fund receives voluntary contributions from California local unions, affiliated organizations, and individuals.

Surety bonds in effect at June 30, 1958 were as follows:

C. J. Haggerty, Secretary-Treasurer	\$10,000.00
Charles A. Hines, Bookkeeper-Cashier	5,000.00

The accounts of the Federation are maintained on a cash basis; no effect has been given in these statements to income accrued but uncollected at June 30, 1958, or to expenses incurred but unpaid at that date. The Federation has consistently followed the accounting practice of charging purchases of furniture, office equipment, and automobiles directly to expense. During the year under review, such charges amounted to approximately \$6,875.00.

In our opinion, subject to the preceding comment that the Federation has consistently followed the accounting practice of charging purchases of furniture, office equipment, and automobiles directly to expense, the accompanying financial statements present fairly, on the cash basis of accounting, the financial position of the California State Federation of Labor at June 30, 1958, and the results of its cash transactions for the year then ended in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

We attach the following:

Exhibit A—Statement of Cash Balances—By Funds—June 30, 1958.

Exhibit B—Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements—By Funds—Year Ended June 30, 1958.

Schedule 1—Detail of Per Capita Receipts and Affiliation Fees—Year Ended June 30, 1958.

Schedule 2—Detail of Per Capita Receipts and Affiliation Fees—By Districts—Year Ended June 30, 1958.

Schedule 3—Detail of Disbursements—Year Ended June 30, 1958.

Very truly yours,
 Skinner & Hammond
 Certified Public Accountants

141

Balances at July 1, 1957.....	\$411,333.24	\$80,836.75	\$35,044.94	\$19,903.39	\$	\$275,548.16
Add: Excess of cash receipts over cash disbursements for year ended June 30, 1958—Exhibit B.....	396,233.26	6,864.14	(2,788.94)	30,440.94	361,717.12	
	\$807,566.50	\$87,700.89	\$32,256.00	\$50,344.33	\$361,717.12	\$275,548.16
Less: Transfer to Occidental Life Insurance Company	275,548.16					275,548.16
Balances at June 30, 1958	\$532,018.34	\$87,700.89	\$32,256.00	\$50,344.33	\$361,717.12	\$ — 0 —

Exhibit B—Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements—By Funds
Year ended June 30, 1958

	Operating Funds			
	Total	General Fund	Legal Defense Fund	Organizing Fund
				“Right to Work” Defense Fund
Cash Receipts:				
Per capita receipts and affiliation fees:				
Per capita tax.....	\$360,533.48	\$226,013.03	\$44,840.14	\$ 89,680.31
Affiliation fees	70.00	70.00		
	<u>\$360,603.48</u>	<u>\$226,083.03</u>	<u>\$44,840.14</u>	<u>\$ 89,680.31</u>
Total Per Capita Receipts and Affiliation Fees—Schedule 1....				\$
Other receipts:				
Contributions to “Right to Work” Defense Fund.....	442,179.70			442,179.70
Interest received on redemption of U. S. Savings Bonds.....	11,700.00			11,700.00
Refund from Marine Cooks & Stewards, AFL-CIO.....	12,000.00			12,000.00
Registration fees—Health and Welfare Conference.....	2,310.00	2,310.00		
Reimbursement from California Labor League for Political Education, for pro rata charge for administrative expenses.....	9,000.00	9,000.00		
Interest received on savings accounts.....	1,097.25	1,097.25		
Registration fees—Labor Conference.....	453.20	453.20		
Miscellaneous receipts and refunds.....	1,513.21	996.54		100.00
	<u>\$840,856.84</u>	<u>\$239,940.02</u>	<u>\$44,840.14</u>	<u>\$113,480.31</u>
Total Cash Receipts				\$442,596.37
Cash Disbursements:				
AFL-CIO Convention and Conference.....	\$ 4,003.43	\$ 4,003.43	\$	\$
55th Annual Convention—Oakland, California.....	48,756.21	48,756.21		
Executive Council meetings.....	20,944.40	20,944.40		
Legislative expenses.....	18,709.57	18,709.57		
Organizing expenses.....	42,589.02			42,589.02
Publicity expenses.....	34,757.38	34,757.38		
Statistical expenses.....	21,363.31	21,363.31		
Legal expenses.....	47,629.08		47,629.08	
Los Angeles office expenses.....	40,450.35			40,450.35
“Right to Work” Defense Fund expenses.....	80,879.25			
Scholarship program expenses.....	2,628.52	2,628.52		
				80,879.25

Exhibit B—Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements—By Funds (Continued)

OFFICERS REPORTS TO

**Schedule 1—Detail of Per Capita Receipts and Affiliation Fees
Year ended June 30, 1958**

AGNEW		AVALON	
California State Employees		Painters No. 1226	\$ 24.00
No. 247	\$ 8.32		
ALAMEDA		AZUSA	
Carpenters and Joiners No. 194 \$	75.84	Chemical Workers No. 112.....	\$ 24.00
Federated Naval Fire Fighters of the Bay Area	24.00		
Fire Fighters No. 689	34.72	BAKERSFIELD	
	\$ 134.56	Barbers No. 317	\$ 66.12
		Building and Construction	
ALHAMBRA		Trades Council	12.00
Chiropractic Professional		Butchers No. 193	160.00
No. 362	\$ 5.00	Carpenters and Joiners	
Electrical Workers No. 47.....	240.00	No. 743	503.20
	\$ 245.00	Central Labor Council	12.00
		Cooks and Waiters No. 550.....	760.00
ALVARADO		Electrical Workers No. 428.....	192.00
Sugar Refinery Workers		Hod Carriers and Common	
No. 20630	\$ 84.08	Laborers No. 220	515.00
		Kern County Fire Fighters	
ANAHEIM		No. 1301	7.00
Barbers No. 766	\$ 24.00	Lathers No. 300	25.20
Carpenters and Joiners		Machinists No. 5	34.64
No. 2203	805.80	Painters No. 314	144.00
	\$ 829.80	Plasterers and Cement Finishers No. 191	118.12
		Plumbers and Steamfitters	
ANTIOCH		No. 460	157.36
Cannery Workers No. 678.....	\$ 190.64	Post Office Clerks No. 472.....	24.32
Carpenters and Joiners		Retail Clerks No. 137	253.00
No. 2038	93.60	Street, Electric Railway and	
Paper Makers No. 330	24.00	Motor Coach Operators	
Paper Makers No. 606	45.68	No. 1291	4.00
Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper		Teamsters, Chauffeurs and	
Mill Workers No. 249	48.00	Warehousemen No. 87	396.00
Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper		Typographical No. 439	42.84
Mill Workers No. 713	48.00		\$ 3,426.80
	\$ 449.92		
ARCATA		BARSTOW	
Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2808	\$ 305.56	Local Federation Council	
Plywood and Veneer Workers No. 2789	178.12	Railway Employees No. 120..\$	12.00
	\$ 483.68	Machinists No. 706	121.80
		Theatrical Stage and Motion	
AUBURN		Picture Operators No. 730....	12.96
DeWitt State Hospital Employees No. 630	\$ 25.28		\$ 146.76
Tri-Counties Building and Construction Trades Council..	12.00	BELL	
	\$ 37.28	American Federation of Grain	
		Millers No. 79	\$ 101.76
		BENICIA	
		Machinists No. 1687	\$ 119.52
		BERKELEY	
		Fire Fighters No. 1227	\$ 80.12
		Insurance Agents No. 219	24.00
		Meat Cutters and Butchers	
		No. 526	41.32
		Municipal Employees, East	
		Bay No. 390	8.40

Painters No. 40	193.32
Teachers No. 1078	24.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 371.16

BETTERAVIA

Sugar Refinery Workers No. 20884	\$ 107.70
---	-----------

BIJOU

Carpenters No. 1789	\$ 59.76
---------------------------	----------

BISHOP

Construction, Production, and General Laborers No. 302.....	\$ 13.44
--	----------

Painters and Decorators No. 1688	22.00
---	-------

	<hr/>
	\$ 35.44

BORON

Chemical Workers No. 85.....	\$ 261.68
------------------------------	-----------

BRAWLEY

Beet Sugar Refinery Work- ers No. 24257	\$ 86.64
--	----------

BURBANK

Culinary Workers and Bar- tenders No. 694	\$ 1,029.88
--	-------------

Federated Fire Fighters of California	12.00
--	-------

Fire Fighters No. 778	24.00
-----------------------------	-------

Glass Bottle Blowers No. 192....	24.00
----------------------------------	-------

Machinists No. 1600	913.68
---------------------------	--------

Plasterers No. 739	209.32
--------------------------	--------

	<hr/>
	\$ 2,212.88

CAMINO

Lumber and Sawmill Work- ers No. 2749	\$ 61.40
--	----------

CAZADERO

Lumber and Sawmill Work- ers No. 2558	\$ 6.00
--	---------

CHESTER

Lumber and Sawmill Work- ers No. 3074	\$ 157.12
--	-----------

CHICO

Barbers No. 354	\$ 24.00
-----------------------	----------

Building and Construction Trades Council	12.00
---	-------

Carpenters and Joiners No. 2043	101.52
--	--------

Carpenters and Joiners No. 2838	50.56
--	-------

Lathers No. 156	26.00
-----------------------	-------

Machinists and Mechanics No. 1853	152.92
--	--------

Millmen No. 1495	259.84
------------------------	--------

Musicians No. 508	28.44
-------------------------	-------

Pipe Trades District Council No. 36	12.00
--	-------

Plasterers and Cement Masons No. 836	25.88
Retail Clerks No. 17	24.00
Typographical No. 667	24.00

	<hr/>
	\$ 741.16

CHINA LAKE

Fire Fighters No. F-32	\$ 24.00
------------------------------	----------

CHULA VISTA

Theatrical Stage Employees No. 761	\$ 24.00
---	----------

CLARKSBURG

Beet Sugar Operators No. 20717	\$ 66.80
---	----------

COLMA

Cemetery Workers and Greens Attendants No. 265....	\$ 72.00
---	----------

COLTON

Cement Masons No. 97.....	\$ 129.08
Operative Potters No. 226.....	80.00

United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers No. 89	115.28
---	--------

	<hr/>
	\$ 324.36

COMPTON

Carpenters and Joiners No. 1437	\$ 695.40
--	-----------

State Employees No. 361	28.00
-------------------------------	-------

	<hr/>
	\$ 723.40

CONCORD

Fire Fighters Association of Mt. Diablo No. 1230	\$ 24.60
---	----------

Machinists No. 1173	271.48
---------------------------	--------

National Postal Transport Association, 8th Division	12.00
--	-------

	<hr/>
	\$ 308.08

CORONA

Brick and Clay Workers No. 674	\$ 27.44
---	----------

Carpenters No. 2048	43.80
---------------------------	-------

Glass Bottle Blowers No. 254....	26.00
----------------------------------	-------

	<hr/>
	\$ 97.24

CORONADO

Masters, Mates and Pilots No. 12	\$ 24.00
---	----------

CROCKETT

Sugar Refinery Workers No. 20037	\$ 527.32
---	-----------

OFFICERS REPORTS TO

CULVER CITY			
Stove Mounters No. 68	\$	43.40	
CUPERTINO			
United Cement, Lime and Gypsum Workers No. 100.....	\$	69.76	
DAVENPORT			
United Cement, Lime and Gypsum Workers No. 46.....	\$	57.60	
DECOTO			
Operating Engineers No. 509.....	\$	46.68	
DIAMOND SPRINGS			
United Cement, Lime and Gypsum Workers No. 158	\$	24.44	
EDWARDS			
Government Employees No. 1406	\$	10.00	
EL CAJON			
Carpenters and Joiners No. 2398	\$	260.80	
EL CENTRO			
Barbers No. 733	\$	24.00	
Bartenders and Culinary Workers No. 338		72.00	
Building and Construction Trades Council		12.00	
Carpenters No. 1070		49.80	
Central Labor Council		6.00	
Painters No. 313		22.00	
Theatrical Stage Employees No. 656		24.00	
Truck Drivers and Warehousemen No. 898		104.00	
	\$	313.80	
EL CERRITO			
Operative Potters No. 165.....	\$	73.08	
Teachers No. 866		82.32	
	\$	155.40	
EL MONTE			
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1507	\$	1,062.03	
Chemical Workers No. 78		64.60	
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 39.....		51.40	
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 200....		24.00	
Hod Carriers and General Laborers No. 1082		743.60	
Painters No. 254		342.42	
	\$	2,288.05	
EUREKA			
Bakers No. 195	\$	22.00	
Barbers No. 431		39.44	
Bartenders No. 318		80.32	
Building and Construction Trades Council		12.00	
CARPENTERS AND JOINERS			
No. 1040		250.16	
Central Labor Council		12.00	
Cooks and Waiters No. 220.....		205.28	
Electrical Workers No. 482.....		26.00	
Fire Fighters No. 652		24.00	
Hospital and Institutional Workers No. 327		57.60	
Laborers No. 181		160.92	
Lathers No. 450		24.00	
Laundry Workers No. 156		22.16	
Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2592		274.76	
Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2868		24.00	
Machinists No. 540		124.40	
Motion Picture Operators No. 430		18.00	
Municipal Employees No. 54....		22.00	
Painters No. 1034		53.08	
Plasterers and Cement Finishers No. 481		25.92	
Plumbers No. 471		46.40	
Plywood and Veneer Workers No. 2931		105.48	
Redwood District Council of Lumber and Sawmill Workers		12.00	
Retail Clerks No. 541		159.40	
Teachers No. 1203		20.00	
Teamsters, Warehousemen and Auto Truck Drivers No. 684		250.84	
Typographical No. 207		24.00	
	\$	2,096.16	
FEATHER FALLS			
Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2801	\$	123.52	
FONTANA			
Fire Fighters No. 1274	\$	25.00	
FORT BRAGG			
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1376	\$	24.72	
FRESH POND			
Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2561	\$	120.20	
FRESNO			
Bakers No. 43	\$	192.00	
Barbers and Beauticians No. 333		77.56	
Bricklayers No. 1		37.08	
Building and Construction Trades Council		12.00	
Building Service Employees No. 110		69.40	
Butchers No. 126		240.00	
Carpenters No. 701		385.48	
Central Labor Council		12.00	

STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

147

[illegible]

OFFICERS REPORTS TO

Hollywood A. F. of L. Film Council	12.00	Butchers No. 563	960.00
Hollywood Painters No. 5.....	416.92	California Federation of Post Office Clerks	12.00
Machinists No. 1185	66.00	Chiropractic Professional No. 365	7.00
Machinists No. 2039	25.76	Glass Bottle Blowers No. 100....	35.20
Make-Up Artists No. 706	144.00	Glass Bottle Blowers No. 114....	60.00
Motion Picture Costumers No. 705	140.00	Glass Bottle Blowers No. 141....	22.00
Motion Picture Crafts Service No. 727	72.00	Glass Bottle Blowers No. 145....	56.76
Motion Picture Film Editors No. 776	388.80	Glass Bottle Blowers No. 146....	132.00
Motion Picture Photographers No. 659	144.00	Machinists (Victory Lodge) No. 1571	195.76
Motion Picture Screen Cartoonists No. 839	198.24	Operative Potters No. 113.....	79.32
Motion Picture Set Painters No. 729	106.40	Operative Potters No. 201.....	88.40
Motion Picture Sound Technicians No. 695	144.00	Painters No. 95	232.81
Motion Picture Studio Art Craftsmen No. 790	24.00		\$ 2,025.25
Motion Picture Studio Cine-technicians No. 789	252.48	INGLEWOOD	
Motion Picture Studio Electrical Technicians No. 728.....	240.00	Carpenters No. 2435	\$ 740.16
Motion Picture 1st Aid Employees No. 767	32.20	Painters and Decorators No. 1346	460.80
Motion Picture Projectionists No. 165	149.84		\$ 1,200.96
Office Employees No. 174	404.20	KINGSBURG	
Plasterers and Cement Finishers No. 755	72.00	Cannery Workers No. 746	\$ 71.08
Post Office Clerks No. 1256.....	42.00	KLAMATH	
Publicists No. 818	54.00	Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2505	\$ 191.08
Scenic Artists No. 816	111.69	Plywood Workers No. 2792.....	14.74
Screen Actors Guild	2,400.00		\$ 205.82
Screen Extras Guild, Inc.....	1,536.00	LAFAYETTE	
Script Supervisors No. 871.....	5.25	Fire Fighters No. 1231	\$ 24.00
Set Designers and Model Makers No. 847	36.00	LA JOLLA	
Story Analysts No. 854	27.16	Carpenters and Joiners No. 1358	\$ 108.80
Studio Carpenters No. 946.....	254.04	LAKEWOOD	
Studio Electricians No. 40.....	144.00	Fire Fighters (Central 11th Naval District) No. F-15.....	\$ 24.00
Studio Grips No. 80.....	144.00	LANCASTER	
Studio Transportation Drivers No. 399	440.00	Carpenters and Joiners No. 2185	\$ 165.56
Studio Utility Employees No. 724	413.40	General Teamsters No. 982.....	132.00
	\$ 12,304.10	Lathers No. 539	24.00
			\$ 321.56
HONOLULU		LODI	
Building and Construction Trades Council	\$ 12.00	Carpenters and Joiners No. 1418	\$ 94.24
Central Labor Council	12.00	Fire Fighters No. 1225	24.00
Hotel, Restaurant Employees, and Bartenders No. 5.....	41.60		\$ 118.24
	\$ 65.60	LOMPOC	
HUNTINGTON PARK		Chemical Workers No. 146.....	\$ 161.32
Allied Industrial Workers No. 990	\$ 144.00		

LONG BEACH

Asbestos Workers No. 20.....	\$ 30.00
Automotive Employees and Laundry Drivers No. 88.....	44.00
Bakers No. 31	293.44
Barbers No. 622	63.60
Bartenders No. 686	432.60
Bricklayers No. 13	110.00
Building and Construction Trades Council	12.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 710	667.60
Cement Finishers No. 791	145.72
Central Labor Council	12.00
Chauffeurs and Sales Driv- ers No. 572	112.00
Chemical Workers	174.48
City Employees No. 112	61.32
Culinary Alliance No. 681	2,628.60
Dry Dock and Ordnance Painters No. 1501	25.96
Federated Fire Fighters, Veterans Administration Hospital	24.00
Fire Fighters No. 372	160.32
General Truck Drivers No. 692.....	1,597.20
Hod Carriers and Common Laborers No. 507	904.00
Lathers No. 172	96.40
Lifeguards No. 1292	28.00
Machinists No. 1235	70.00
Machinists No. 1785	115.80
Motion Picture Projection- ists No. 521	33.12
Musicians Association No. 353.....	48.00
Painters No. 256	419.88
Plasterers and Cement Fin- ishers No. 343	155.84
Plumbers and Steamfitters No. 494	279.88
Post Office Clerks No. 543.....	48.00
Printing Pressmen No. 285.....	30.28
Retail Clerks No. 324	2,016.00
Rig Builders No. 1458.....	82.76
Roofers No. 72	41.84
Sheet Metal Workers No. 420....	301.00
Sheet Metal Workers No. 520....	33.08
State Council Culinary Work- ers, Bartenders, and Hotel Service Employees	12.00
Stereotypers No. 161	24.87
Teachers No. 1263	41.56
Typographical No. 650	84.16
United Cement, Lime and Gypsum Workers No. 59.....	71.04
United Garment Workers No. 56	24.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 11,556.35

LOS ALTOS

Fire Fighters No. 1167	\$ 24.00
------------------------------	----------

LOS ANGELES

Advertising and Public Rela- tions Employees No. 518.....	\$ 22.00
American Flint Glass Work- ers No. 139	81.40
American Guild of Variety Artists	144.00
Asbestos Workers No. 5.....	132.00
Auto-Marine, Production Fin- ishers, Equipment Mainte- nance and P. S. Painters No. 1798	240.00
Auto Park and Parking Gar- age Employees No. 62.....	185.96
Bakers No. 37	706.20
Bakers No. 453	99.00
Bakery and Confectionery Workers No. 400	320.00
Bakery Drivers No. 276	595.97
Barbers No. 295	407.44
Bartenders No. 284	1,040.40
Beauticians No. 295-A	24.00
Beer Drivers and Helpers No. 203	276.00
Bill Posters and Billers No. 32	44.00
Boilermakers No. 92	480.00
Boilermakers, Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers and Helpers No. 1212	53.00
Bookbinders No. 63	284.80
Bricklayers No. 2	180.00
Brick and Clay Workers No. 661	15.60
Building Material and Dump Truck Drivers No. 420.....	2,827.68
Building Service Employees (Public Events Ticket Sell- ers) No. 76	60.00
Building Service Employees (Special Office Guards) No. 193	24.00
Bus Drivers No. 1222	96.00
Cabinet Makers and Millmen No. 721	1,072.40
California Labor Commis- sioners No. 975	10.00
California Legislative and Co- ordinating Council	12.00
California State Association of Barbers and Beauticians....	12.00
California State Association of Electrical Workers	12.00
California State Association of Letter Carriers	13.00
California State Council of Building Service Employees..	24.00
Cap Makers No. 22	34.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 25	781.96
Carpenters and Joiners No. 929	511.04
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1497	927.72

Carpenters and Joiners		Glass Workers No. 636	619.08
No. 1976	235.32	Government Employees	
Cement Masons No. 627	541.80	No. 1167	18.00
Central Labor Council	12.00	Gunite Workers No. 345	136.80
Chemical Workers No. 11	282.00	Hardwood Floor Workers	
Chemical Workers No. 350	28.44	No. 2144	442.76
Chemical Workers No. 452	176.56	Hay Haulers, Dairy Employees	
Child Welfare Workers		No. 737	55.00
No. 816	24.00	Health Workers No. 1036.....	30.48
Cleaning and Dye House		Hod Carriers and Common	
Workers No. 11	44.00	Laborers No. 300	2,250.00
Cloak Makers No. 55	220.00	Hod Carriers and Common	
Cloak Makers No. 58	220.00	Laborers No. 696	50.92
Commercial Telegraphers		Hosiery Workers (American	
(Western Union) No. 48.....	120.00	Federation of) No. 43.....	24.00
Cooks No. 468	1,100.00	Hotel Service Employees	
Council of Federated Munic-		No. 765	480.00
ipal Crafts	12.00	House, Building, and General	
Dairy Employees, Plant and		Movers No. 923	98.40
Clerical No. 93	480.00	Ice Drivers, Cold Storage	
Dental Technicians No. 100.....	48.00	Warehousemen No. 942	66.00
Department, Variety, and		Insurance Drivers No. 86.....	175.92
Specialty Store Employees		Iron Workers (Shopmen)	
No. 777	512.52	No. 509	364.00
Dining Car Employees No. 582	144.00	Jewelry Workers No. 23	168.00
District Council Brick and		Joint Council Building Service	
Clay Workers No. 11	12.00	Employees of Southern	
District Council of Carpenters..	12.00	California No. 8	15.00
District Council of Chemical		Joint Council of Teamsters	
Workers No. 5	12.00	No. 42	12.00
District Council of Machinists		Joint Executive Board, Culi-	
No. 94	13.00	nary Workers	12.00
District Council of Painters		Joint Executive Conference,	
No. 36	13.00	Electrical Workers of	
District Council of Plasterers		Southern California	12.00
and Cement Masons of		Ladies Garment Workers	
Southern California	24.00	No. 84	110.00
Electrical Workers No. 11.....	1,700.00	Ladies Garment Workers	
Electrical Workers No. B-18.....	312.00	No. 96	144.00
Electrical Workers No. 1710	240.00	Ladies Garment Workers	
Electrotypers No. 137	33.60	No. 97	110.00
Elevator Constructors No. 18....	80.64	Ladies Garment Workers	
Elevator Operators and Start-		(Ladies Tailors) No. 445.....	48.00
ers No. 217	48.00	Ladies Garment Workers	
Film Exchange Employees		No. 451	96.00
No. 61-B	61.56	Ladies Garment Workers	
Fire Fighters of Los Angeles		(Accessories) No. 482	108.00
City No. 748	431.48	Ladies Garment Workers	
Firemen and Oilers (Glendale		No. 483	51.00
Municipal Employees)		Ladies Garment Workers	
No. 152	8.00	No. 496	108.00
Food, Drug, and Beverage		Ladies Garment Workers	
Warehousemen No. 595.....	1,453.80	No. 497	22.00
Food, Processors, Packers and		Ladies Garment Workers	
Warehousemen No. 547	44.00	No. 512	44.00
Freight Handlers, Clerks and		Lathers No. 42	108.60
Helpers No. 357	80.00	Lathers No. 42-A	493.56
Fruit and Produce Drivers		Laundry and Dry Cleaning	
No. 630	400.00	Workers No. 52	400.00
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 19.....	93.56	Laundry, Linen Supply and	
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 122....	26.00	Dry Cleaning Drivers	
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 125....	124.80	No. 928	625.24
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 129....	24.60	Line Drivers No. 224	220.00
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 208....	24.00		

Linoleum, Carpet, and Soft Tile Workers No. 1247.....	698.44	Offset Workers, Printing Pressmen, and Assistants No. 78	264.00
Local Freight Drivers No. 208..	80.00	Operating Engineers No. 12.....	4,488.00
Los Angeles Allied Printing Trades Council	12.00	Operative Potters No. 183	23.60
Los Angeles Building Con- struction Trades Council	12.00	Pacific South West District Council of Government Employees	12.00
Los Angeles City Employees No. 119	24.00	Package and General Utility Drivers No. 396	80.00
Los Angeles County Em- ployees No. 187	37.24	Painters No. 116	399.92
Los Angeles County Fire Department Employees No. 1420	26.00	Painters No. 434	147.36
Los Angeles County Fire Protection District No. 1014..	506.00	Painters No. 1348	120.00
Los Angeles County Guards No. 790	39.84	Pari-Mutuel Employees Guild No. 280	145.00
Los Angeles County Park and Recreation Department No. 517	114.70	Paper Handlers No. 3.....	56.00
Los Angeles County Mechan- ical Supervisory Em- ployees No. 180	24.00	Paper Makers No. 208	77.68
Los Angeles County Probation Officers No. 685	105.60	Paper Makers No. 349	62.60
Los Angeles County Superior Court Clerks No. 575.....	41.24	Pattern Makers Association.....	38.40
Los Angeles Department Water and Power Em- ployees No. 233	24.00	Photo Engravers No. 32.....	283.20
Los Angeles Editorial Asso- ciation No. 21241	101.44	Plasterers No. 2	480.00
Lumber and Sawmill Work- ers No. 2288	1,570.36	Plumbers No. 78	1,145.12
Machinists No. 311	1,900.00	Post Office Clerks No. 64.....	208.00
Machinists No. 1186	960.00	Printing Specialists and Paper Converters No. 388.....	480.00
Mailers No. 9	203.80	Printing Specialists and Paper Products No. 522.....	150.96
Meat and Provision Drivers No. 626	440.00	Provision House Workers No. 274	1,440.00
Meat Cutters No. 421	1,625.00	Public Service Carpenters No. 2231	28.84
Metal Polishers No. 67.....	36.00	Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers No. 266.....	96.00
Metal Trades Council of Southern California	12.00	Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers No. 268	44.32
Millwrights No. 1607	279.60	Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers No. 307.....	260.00
Miscellaneous Employees No. 440	1,382.60	Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers No. 550.....	51.92
Miscellaneous Foremen and Public Works Superintend- ents No. 413	52.60	Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers No. 680	42.00
Molders and Foundry Work- ers No. 374	65.28	Railway News Service No. 357..	38.00
Motion Picture Projectionists No. 150	298.00	Re-inforced Iron Workers No. 416	384.00
Municipal Truck Drivers No. 403	97.44	Retail Clerks No. 770	4,800.00
Musicians No. 47	1,600.00	Retail Milk Drivers and Sales- men No. 441	405.40
National Postal Transporta- tion Association	24.00	Roofers No. 36	500.52
New Furniture and Appliance Drivers No. 196	370.00	Service and Maintenance Em- ployees No. 399	600.00
Newspaper Pressmen No. 18....	182.40	Sheet Metal Workers No. 108....	1,871.00
Office Employees No. 30.....	200.00	Shinglers No. 1125	258.04
Office Employees No. 305	43.04	Sign and Pictorial Painters No. 831	60.00
		Southern California Conference of Allied Printing Trades Councils	12.00
		Southern California Council of Public Employees No. 20	5.00
		Southern California District Council of Laborers	12.00
		Southern California District Council of Lathers	12.00

Southern California Printing Specialists and Paper Products Joint Council No. 2	23.00
Southern California Pipe Trades District Council No. 16	12.00
Southern California Typographical Conference	12.00
Sportswear and Cotton Garment Workers No. 266	312.00
Sprinkler Fitters No. 709	158.40
Stage Employees No. 33	132.00
Stationary Operating Engineers No. 501	408.00
Steel, Paper House, Chemical Workers No. 578	88.00
Stereotypers No. 58	96.00
Stove Mounters No. 125	80.84
Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees No. 1277	480.00
Structural Iron Workers No. 433	440.00
Switchmen No. 43	26.00
Teachers No. 1021	48.32
Teamsters, Automotive Workers No. 495	264.00
Theatrical Press Agents and Managers No. 18032	24.00
Theatrical Wardrobe Attendants No. 768	24.00
Tile Layers No. 18	84.00
Typographical No. 174	912.00
United Association Steamfitters No. 250	480.00
United Garment Workers No. 94	24.00
United Garment Workers No. 125	175.04
Upholsterers No. 15	192.00
Van, Storage and Furniture Drivers No. 389	174.00
Waiters No. 17	1,288.00
Waitresses No. 639	2,212.32
Western Warehousemen and Produce Council	12.00
Warehousemen Dairy and Ice Cream Drivers No 306	220.00
Wholesale Delivery Drivers No. 848	1,366.64
Wholesale Wine and Liquor Salesmen No. 151	34.80
Window Cleaners No. 349	60.00
Women's Union Label League No. 36	12.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 71,587.87

LOS BANOS

Carpenters and Joiners No. 539	\$ 19.00
--------------------------------------	----------

LOS GATOS

Carpenters and Joiners No. 2006	\$ 152.48
Fire Fighters Association of Santa Clara County No. 1165	28.24
	<hr/>
	\$ 180.72

LOS NIETOS

Brick and Clay Workers No. 824	\$ 118.92
--------------------------------------	-----------

LOYALTON

Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2695	\$ 85.20
---	----------

LYNWOOD

Teachers No. 1294	\$ 8.00
-------------------------	---------

MADERA

Carpenters and Joiners No. 2189	\$ 10.00
Construction and General Laborers No. 920	24.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 34.00

MANTECA

Beet Sugar Operators No. 20733	\$ 76.52
--------------------------------------	----------

MARE ISLAND

Federal Fire Fighters No. 5-48	\$ 28.12
--------------------------------------	----------

MARTELL

Carpenters and Joiners No. 1522	\$ 24.00
---------------------------------------	----------

MARTINEZ

Allied Hospital Employees No. 251	\$ 97.32
Building-Trades Council	12.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 2046	144.00
Central Labor Council	12.00
Construction and General Laborers No. 324	1,222.76
Painters No. 741	72.00
Plumbers and Pipe Fitters No. 159	180.00
Teamsters No. 315	652.92
	<hr/>
	\$ 2,393.00

MARYSVILLE

Automotive Machinists No. 1887	\$ 17.48
Bartenders and Culinary Alliance No. 715	104.00
Building and Construction Trades Council	12.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1570	160.68

STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

153

Central Labor Council	12.00
General Teamsters No. 137	450.00
Hod Carriers and General Laborers No. 121	180.00
Stage Employees No. 216	24.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 960.16

MAYWOOD

Glass Bottle Blowers No. 148....\$	109.20
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 190....	24.00
Machinists No. 795	121.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 254.20

MENTONE

Glass Bottle Blowers No. 204....\$	16.00
------------------------------------	-------

MERCED

Carpenters and Joiners No. 1202	\$ 82.88
Central Labor Council	12.00
Construction and General Laborers No. 995	170.86
Plasterers and Cement Masons No. 672	24.00
Typographical No. 865	20.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 309.74

MILL VALLEY

Carpenters and Joiners No. 1710	\$ 114.64
---------------------------------------	-----------

MODESTO

Barbers No. 787	\$ 25.08
Building and Construction Trades Council	13.00
Building Service Employees No. 415	19.00
California State Hospital Employees No. 636	33.52
Cannery Workers No. 748.....	192.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1235	192.76
Central Labor Council	12.00
Chemical Workers No. 190	88.80
Culinary Workers and Bartenders No. 542	494.56
Electrical Workers No. 684	129.00
Fire Fighters No. 1289	17.00
Hod Carriers and General Laborers No. 1130	303.28
Musicians No. 652	72.72
Office Employees No. 208	24.00
Packing House Employees and Warehousemen No. 698	157.40
Painters No. 317	29.92
Plasterers No. 429	34.80
Plumbers and Steam-fitters No. 437	96.00
Post Office Clerks No. 635	18.00
Sign and Pictorial Artists No. 1629	24.00

Stage Employees No. 564	24.00
Teamsters No. 386	680.00
Typographical No. 689	24.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 2,704.84

MOJAVE

Carpenters and Joiners No. 1239	\$ 106.60
---------------------------------------	-----------

MONROVIA

Electrical Workers No. 1008\$	336.52
Machinists No. 1893	240.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 576.52

MONTEREY

Barbers No. 896	\$ 29.28
Building and Construction Trades Council	18.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1323	376.60
Central Labor Council	10.00
Fish Cannery Workers of Pacific	184.64
Hod Carriers and Common Laborers No. 690	232.40
Hotel, Restaurant Employees, and Bartenders No. 423.....	440.40
Painters and Decorators No. 272	24.00
Plasterers and Cement Finishers No. 337	32.76
Plumbers No. 62	48.00
Seine and Line Fishermen	94.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 1,490.08

MOUNTAIN VIEW

Carpenters and Joiners No. 1280	\$ 611.32
City Employees No. 514	24.00
Hardwood Floor Layers No. 3107	83.96
	<hr/>
	\$ 719.28

MYERS FLAT

Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2952	\$ 8.00
---	---------

NAPA

Bartenders and Culinary Workers No. 753	\$ 180.36
Building and Construction Trades Council	6.00
California State Hospital Employees No. 174	18.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 2114	163.60
Central Labor Council	12.00
Hod Carriers and General Laborers No. 371	183.20
Machinists No. 1419	120.00

Packing House Employees No. 668	37.40
Plasterers and Cement Finishers No. 766	24.00
United Garment Workers No. 197	168.52
	<hr/>
	\$ 913.08

NEWARK

Chemical Workers No. 62	\$ 105.84
-------------------------------	-----------

NORTH FORK

Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2762	\$ 83.36
--	----------

NORWALK

Brick and Clay Workers No. 487	\$ 50.08
---	----------

OAKLAND

Alameda County School Em- ployees No. 257	\$ 100.40
Allied Printing Trades Council	12.00
Aircraft Workers (Machinists) No. 854	421.00
Auto and Ship Painters No. 1176	202.84
Automotive Machinists No. 1546	2,364.84
Bakers No. 119	216.00
Bakery Wagon Drivers No. 432	367.20
Barbers No. 134	213.60
Bartenders No. 52	611.52
Boilermakers No. 10	250.00
Bricklayers No. 8	96.00
Building and Construction Trades Council Alameda County	12.00
Building Service Employees No. 18	456.36
Butchers No. 120	1,080.00
California Conference of Typographical Unions	12.00
Candy and Confectionery Workers No. 444	100.00
Cannery Workers No. 750	1,937.90
Carpenters and Joiners No. 36	949.80
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1473	270.52
Carpet, Linoleum and Soft Tile Workers No. 1290	168.00
Cement Masons No. 594	216.00
Cemetery Workers and Greens Attendants No. 322	24.00
Central Labor Council	12.00
Chauffeurs No. 923	221.28
Cleaning and Dye House Workers No. 3009	628.04
Clerks and Lumber Handlers No. 939	36.00
Commercial Telegraphers No. 208	48.00

Construction and General Laborers No. 304	1,392.00
Cooks No. 228	960.00
Culinary Alliance No. 31	1,788.96
Department and Specialty Stores Employees No. 1265...	259.60
Dining Car Cooks and Wait- ers No. 456	156.00
District Council of Chemical Workers No. 2	12.00
District Council of Painters No. 16	9.00
Electrical Workers No. 595	600.00
Electrical Workers No. 1245	4,800.00
Federal Fire Fighters—Bay Area No. 5-9	24.00
Federal Fire Fighters Associa- tion—Oakland Naval Supply Center	4.00
Fire Fighters No. 55	287.20
Floorlayers and Carpenters No. 1861	48.00
Gardeners, Florists, and Nurserymen No. 1206	40.80
General Warehousemen No. 853	350.00
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 2	48.00
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 137	35.68
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 141	240.00
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 142	42.92
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 155	156.00
Hod Carriers No. 166	120.00
Iron Workers No. 378	96.00
Iron Workers (Shopmen) No. 491	96.00
Lathers No. 88	90.00
Laundry Workers No. 3012	521.84
Machinists No. 284	960.00
Machinists No. 1566	480.00
Milk Drivers & Dairy Em- ployees No. 302	603.04
Motion Picture Projectionists No. 169	41.76
Newspaper & Periodical Drivers No. 96	86.24
Newspaper Printing Pressmen No. 39	40.64
Nursery, Gardeners, and Florists No. 300	48.00
Office Employees No. 29	846.12
Operating Stationary Engi- neers No. 736	55.20
Pacific Coast Council of Bakers	12.00
Painters No. 127	333.12
Paint Makers No. 1101	267.68
Plasterers No. 112	73.00
Plumbers and Gas Fitters No. 444	432.00
Printing Pressmen No. 125	96.00
Printing Specialty and Paper Products No. 382	672.00
Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers No. 255	42.92

Railway Carmen No. 735	36.20
Retail Delivery Drivers No. 588	220.40
Retail Food Clerks No. 870.....	576.00
Roofers No. 81	120.00
Sheet Metal Workers No. 216....	240.00
Sheet Metal Workers No. 355....	96.00
Shipyard and Marine Shop Laborers No. 886	336.00
Sleeping Car Porters (Oak- land Division)	120.00
Steamfitters and Helpers No. 342	643.00
Street Carmen No. 192	576.48
Teachers No. 771	59.44
Teamsters No. 70	2,042.88
Teamsters Automotive Em- ployees No. 78	132.00
Technical Engineers American Federation No. 39	29.80
Theatrical Employees B-82	48.00
Theatrical Janitors No. 121	38.40
Theatrical Stage Employees No. 107	26.08
Typographical No. 36	267.40
University of California Em- ployees No. 371	97.04
Welders and Burners No. 10	144.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 34,144.14

OJAI

Federal Fire Fighters of Ventura County No. F-54.....	\$ 24.00
--	----------

OLIVE VIEW

Los Angeles City, County, and State Employees No. 347..	\$ 96.00
--	----------

OMO RANCH

Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2728	\$ 41.80
--	----------

ONTARIO

City Employees No. 472	\$ 24.00
Machinists No. 120	52.00
Machinists No 821	17.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 93.00

ORANGE

General Truck Drivers, Ware- housemen, and Helpers No. 235	\$ 193.00
Sales Drivers, Food Proces- sors and Warehousemen No. 952	288.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 481.00

ORO GRANDE

Cement Workers No. 192	\$ 144.53
------------------------------	-----------

OROVILLE

Barbers No. 643.....	\$ 24.00
----------------------	----------

Bartenders and Culinary Work- ers No. 654	194.08
Butchers No. 460	24.00
Cannery, Dried Fruit, and Nut Workers No. 849	374.04
Carpenters No. 1240	141.32
Central Labor Council	12.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 769.44

OXNARD

Barbers No. 959	\$ 26.00
Carpenters No. 2042	57.40
Sugar Workers No. 20875	103.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 186.40

PALM CITY

Carpenters and Joiners No. 1490	\$ 60.48
--	----------

PALMDALE

Painters No. 1793	\$ 97.52
Typographical No. 852	19.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 116.52

PALM SPRINGS

Carpenters and Joiners No. 1046	\$ 190.20
Fire Fighters No. 1154	24.00
Lathers No. 454	24.00
Painters No. 1627	73.92
	<hr/>
	\$ 312.12

PALO ALTO

Barbers No. 914	\$ 61.60
Bindery Workers No. 21	24.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 668	499.68
Painters No. 388	152.86
Typographical No. 521	39.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 777.14

PASADENA

Carpenters and Joiners No. 769	\$ 579.20
Cement Masons No. 923	112.24
Central Labor Council	12.00
Fire Fighters No. 809	66.00
Hod Carriers No. 439	240.00
Hotel, Restaurant Employees, and Bartenders Alliance No. 531	721.48
Lathers No. 81	150.40
Meat Cutters No. 439	864.00
Operative Potters No. 222	59.60
Painters and Decorators No. 92	254.88
Pasadena School District Em- ployees No. 606	52.04
Plasterers and Cement Finish- ers No. 194	227.84
Plumbers No. 280	164.20

OFFICERS REPORTS TO

Printing Pressmen No. 155.....	12.00
Typographical No. 583	67.20
	<hr/>
	\$ 3,583.08

PATTON	
California State Hospital Em- ployees No. 128	\$ 26.00

PETALUMA	
Barbers No. 419	\$ 24.00
Bartenders and Culinary Work- ers No. 217	125.36
Beauticians No. 419-A	24.00
Machinists No. 1596	59.40
Typographical No. 600	24.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 256.76

PITTSBURG	
Barbers No. 917	\$ 29.88
Bartenders and Culinary Work- ers No. 822	320.32
Chemical Workers No. 23	201.48
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 160....	80.54
Paper Makers No. 329	97.40
Plasterers and Cement Finish- ers No. 825	40.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 769.62

PLACERVILLE	
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1992	\$ 36.00
Hotel and Restaurant Workers No. 793	60.28
	<hr/>
	\$ 96.28

POMONA	
Barbers No. 702	\$ 70.16
Central Labor Council	3.00
Chemical Workers No. 58	72.64
Chiropractic Professional No. 363	7.00
General Teamsters, Sales- drivers No. 871	201.00
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 34.....	74.26
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 232....	18.00
Hod Carriers No. 806	363.00
Machinists No. 1586	120.60
Painters and Decorators No. 979	290.96
Paper Makers No. 318	152.04
Plumbers and Steamfitters No. 398	360.00
Printing Pressmen No. 320.....	24.20
Retail Clerks No. 1428	1,038.32
Typographical No. 994	80.40
	<hr/>
	\$ 2,875.58

PORT CHICAGO	
Chemical Workers No. 25	\$ 60.08

PORTERVILLE	
Carpenters and Joiners No. 2126	\$ 43.40

QUARTZ HILL	
Federal Fire Fighters (Flight Test Center) No. F-53	\$ 20.28

QUINCY	
Lumber and Sawmill Work- ers No. 1123	\$ 125.44

RED BLUFF	
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1254	\$ 121.00

REDDING	
Auto and Machinists No. 1397..	\$ 136.80
Building and Construction Trades Council N. E. Cali- fornia	10.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1599	302.72
Central Labor Council — Five Counties	12.00
Culinary Workers, Bartenders, and Hotel Service Employees No. 470	412.00
Hod Carriers and Common Laborers No. 961	312.00
Laundry Workers No. 92	23.48
Lumber and Sawmill Work- ers No. 2608	688.62
Meat Cutters and Butchers No. 352	151.76
Motion Picture Projectionists No. 739	24.00
Musicians No. 113	51.72
Painters and Decorators No. 315	52.04
Plasterers and Cement Masons No. 805	37.92
Plumbers and Steamfitters No. 662	61.60
Retail Clerks No. 1364.....	279.72
Typographical No. 993	28.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 2,584.38

REDLANDS	
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1343	\$ 136.64
Operative Potters No. 214	45.74
	<hr/>
	\$ 182.38

REDONDO BEACH	
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1478	\$ 659.72

REDWOOD CITY	
Cement Mill Workers No. 760..	\$ 61.60
General Warehouse and Food Processors No. 655	200.00

STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

157

Teachers No. 1163	22.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 283.60

RENO, NEVADA

Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2903	\$ 22.00
---	----------

RESEDA

Carpenters and Joiners No. 844	\$ 803.36
--------------------------------------	-----------

RICHMOND

Barbers No. 508	\$ 38.40
Bartenders and Culinary Workers No. 595	895.00
Beauticians No. 508A	42.72
Boilermakers No. 513	156.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 642	499.24
Electrical Workers No. 302	371.76
Fabricated Metal and Enamelware Workers No. 18524	49.40
Fire Fighters No. 188	63.72
Firemen and Oilers No. 972	4.00
Motion Picture Projectionists No. 560	24.00
Office Employees No. 243	76.80
Operative Potters No. 89	66.12
Operative Potters No. 302	6.48
Painters No. 560	178.36
Public Employees of Contra Costa County No. 302	60.84
Retail Clerks No. 1179	1,141.16
Typographical No. 738	23.50
	<hr/>
	\$ 3,697.50

RIVERSIDE

Barbers No. 171	\$ 50.40
Building and Construction Trades Council	12.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 235	345.64
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1959	60.00
Central Labor Council	12.00
Chiropractic Professional No. 359	9.48
City Employees No. 395	24.00
District Council of Painters No. 48	12.00
District Council of United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers No. 3	12.00
Electric Workers No. 440	104.00
Hod Carriers and General Laborers No. 1184	679.92
Machinists No. 1104	125.00
Painters No. 286	103.92
Retail Clerks No. 1167	998.44
Sheet Metal Workers No. 509	156.71

United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers No. 48	170.16
	<hr/>
	\$ 2,875.67

ROSEVILLE

Carpenters No. 1147	\$ 16.80
Central Labor Council—Tri Counties	12.00
Railway Carmen No. 231	291.00
Switchmen No. 263	97.48
	<hr/>
	\$ 417.28

SACRAMENTO

Bakers and Confectionery Workers No. 85	\$ 263.92
Barbers No. 112	103.80
Bartenders No. 600	288.00
Bookbinders No. 35	75.00
Building and Construction Trades Council	12.00
Building Service Employees No. 22	144.00
Building Service Employees No. 411	24.00
Butchers No. 498	903.92
California Council of State Employees No. 56	12.00
California Department Industrial Relations No. 1031	30.00
California State Federation of Teachers	12.00
Cannery Workers No. 857	1,620.08
Carpenters and Joiners No. 586	836.00
Carpet, Linoleum, and Tile Workers No. 1237	59.04
Cement Finishers No. 582	154.24
Central Labor Council	12.00
Chauffeurs and Teamsters No. 150	2,084.44
Construction and General Laborers No. 185	1,140.00
Cooks No. 683	322.28
County Employees No. 146	48.00
District Council of Carpenters	12.00
Electrical Workers No. 340	120.00
Federal Fire Fighters—Greater Sacramento No. F-57	29.96
Fire Fighters No. 522	82.20
Hod Carriers No. 262	70.00
Iron Workers No. 118	250.00
Iron Workers (Shopmen) No. 504	42.33
Jewelry Workers No. 112	24.00
Lathers No. 109	40.56
Laundry & Cleaning Drivers No. 234	37.52
Laundry and Dry Cleaners No. 75	264.00
Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 3170	144.00
Millmen No. 1618	98.40

OFFICERS REPORTS TO

Miscellaneous Employees No. 393	431.20	Barbers No. 253	\$ 73.68
Motion Picture Machine Operators No. 252	24.00	California State Highway Em- ployees No. 533	24.00
Municipal Utility District Employees No. 1321	32.04	Carpenters and Joiners No. 944	865.20
Musicians No. 12	61.28	Central Labor Council	12.00
Northern California Joint Executive Conference Elec- trical Workers	12.00	City School Maintenance Em- ployees No. 1076	43.98
Painters No. 487	336.00	County Employees No. 122.....	223.44
Plumbers and Steamfitters No. 447	144.00	Culinary Workers and Bar- tenders No. 535	838.48
Printing Pressmen No. 60.....	60.00	District Council of Carpenters and Joiners	12.00
Printing Specialties and Paper Converters No. 460	21.00	Electrical Workers No. 477	201.00
Retail Clerks No. 588	960.00	Electrical Workers No. 543.....	49.00
Rocket and Guided Missile No. 946	1,067.56	Electrical Workers No. 848	137.34
Roofers No. 47	71.00	Fire Fighters No. 891	48.24
Sacramento County Board of Education Employees No. 258	155.20	Firemen and Oilers No. 1077....	38.80
Sheet Metal Workers No. 162....	187.90	General Truck Drivers No. 467	250.00
Stage Employees No. 50	24.00	Government Employees No. 1485	95.52
Stereotypers No. 86	24.00	Hod Carriers and Laborers No. 783	953.76
Street Carmen No. 256	70.40	Lathers No. 252	89.99
Teachers No. 31	24.00	Laundry Workers No. 186	70.52
Teachers No. 727	24.00	Musicians No. 167	9.00
Teamsters, Auto and Chauf- feurs No. 165	132.00	Machinists No. 1047	129.00
Theater Employees No. B-66	44.00	Millwright and Machinery Erectors No. 1113	136.24
Typographical No. 46	146.36	Motion Picture Machine Oper- ators No. 577	24.00
Waiters and Waitresses No. 561	469.96	Office Employees No. 83	27.96
Wholesale Plumbing House Employees Auxiliary No. 447	40.80	Painters No. 775	168.52
	\$ 13,922.39	Plasterers and Cement Finish- ers No. 73	133.15
		Plumbers and Steamfitters No. 364	288.00
SALINAS		Printing Pressmen No. 138	24.00
Barbers No. 827	\$ 24.00	Sales Drivers and Dairy Employees No. 166	220.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 925	212.08	Stage Employees No. 614	24.00
Central Labor Council	12.00		\$ 5,210.82
Fire Fighters No. 1270	24.00		
General Teamsters and Warehousemen No. 890	320.00	SAN BRUNO	
Hod Carriers and Common Laborers No. 272	119.04	Air Transport Employees No. 1781	\$ 160.00
Hotel and Restaurant Em- ployees No. 355	152.64		
Mechanics and Machinists No. 1824	84.00	SAN DIEGO	
Painters No. 1104	47.20	Bakers No. 315	\$ 220.00
Plumbers and Steamfitters No. 503	36.00	Bindery Workers No. 40	22.00
Retail Clerks No. 839	205.72	Brick and Clay Workers No. 955	18.00
Teachers No. 1020	30.00	Bridgemen No. 229	84.00
	\$ 1,266.68	Building and Construction Trades Council	12.00
		Building Material and Dump Truck Drivers No. 36	624.32
SAN ANDREAS		Building Service Employees No. 102	208.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 386	\$ 23.44	Butchers and Meat Cutters No. 229	864.00

Carpenters and Joiners No. 1296	715.16	Shipwrights, Boatbuilders and Caulkers No. 1300	116.16
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1571	542.56	Stereotypers No. 82	24.00
Carpet, Linoleum, and Tile Workers No. 1711	91.80	Street Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees No. 1309	227.52
Central Labor Council	12.00	Teachers No. 1278	20.00
Chauffeurs, Taxicab, Funeral and Ambulance Drivers No. 481	286.00	Teamsters and Chauffeurs No. 542	827.52
Commercial Telegraphers No. 150	33.00	Theatrical Stage Employees No. 122	18.00
County and Municipal Em- ployees No. 127	379.80	Tile Layers, Marble Masons No. 17	57.52
Culinary Alliance and Hotel Service Employees No. 402....	1,498.40	Typographical No. 221	163.20
District Council of Carpenters..	12.00	Waiters and Bartenders No. 500	508.60
Electrical Workers No. 465	242.00		\$ 15,557.94
Electrical Workers No. 569	701.60		
Federal Fire Fighters No. F-33	38.80		
Fire Fighters Association No. 145	194.48	SAN FERNANDO	
Fish Cannery Workers of Pacific	960.00	Government Employees(Vet- erans Administration)	
Floorlayers No. 2074	55.80	No. 1043	\$ 48.00
Government Employees (Navy Civilian) No. 1085	50.68		
Government Employees (Naval Supply Depot) No. 1399	26.00	SAN FRANCISCO	
Hod Carriers and Construction Laborers No. 89	1,144.00	Allied Printing Trades Council \$	12.00
Insurance Agents No. 29	32.00	American Guild of Variety Artists	96.00
Iron Workers No. 627	106.72	Apartment and Hotel Em- ployees No. 14	240.00
Joint Council, Laundry Work- ers No. 2	12.00	Asbestos Workers No. 16	131.00
Laundry and Dry Cleaners No. 259	84.84	Asbestos Workers No. 29	24.00
Machinists No. 2191	83.68	Auto Drivers and Demon- strators No. 960	246.00
Machinists No. 2192	102.20	Automotive Machinists No. 1305	1,824.60
Machinists No. 2193	62.44	Automotive Warehousemen No. 241	90.00
Machinists No. 2194	58.48	Bakers No. 24	720.00
Machinists No. 2195	127.68	Bakery Wagon Drivers No. 484	524.24
Machinists No. 2196	53.44	Barbers and Beauticians No. 148	432.00
Machinists Silvergate District Council No. 50	13.00	Bartenders No. 41	1,371.16
Mailers No. 75	24.00	Bay Cities Metal Trades Council	12.00
Millmen No. 2020	308.18	Bill Posters and Billers No. 44..	24.00
Motion Picture Projectionists No. 297	39.12	Boilermakers No. 6	480.00
Newspaper Printing Pressmen No. 48	12.20	Boilermakers, Blacksmiths, etc. No. 1168	240.00
Office Employees No. 139	38.28	Bookbinders and Bindery- women No. 31-125	216.00
Operating Engineers No. 526	96.00	Bottlers No. 896	660.00
Painters No. 333	348.00	Brewery Drivers, No. 888	180.00
Plasterers and Cement Finish- ers No. 346	472.56	Brewers, Maltsters and Yeast Makers No. 893	252.00
Printing Pressmen No. 140.....	39.00	Building and Construction Trades Council	12.00
Retail Clerks No. 1222	1,276.36	Building Material and Con- struction Teamsters No. 216..	384.00
Roofers No. 45	58.00	Building Service Employees No. 87	576.00
Salesdrivers, Helpers and Dairy Employees No. 683	968.00	Building Service Employees No. 167	24.00
Sheet Metal Workers No. 206....	116.00	Butchers No. 115	1,584.00
Shinglers No. 553	26.84		

Butchers No. 508	814.08	Film Exchange Employees	
California Allied Printing		No. B-17	48.00
Trades Conference	12.00	Film Exchange Employees	
California Conference of Book-		No. F-17	69.60
binders	12.00	Garage Employees No. 665	80.00
California Pipe Trades		Garment Cutters No. 45	32.60
Council	12.00	General Warehousemen	
California State Council of		No. 860	557.20
Carpenters	12.00	Glaziers and Glass Workers	
California State Council of		No. 718	144.00
Lumber and Sawmill Work-		Government Employees	
ers	12.00	No. 634	76.12
California State Council of		Government Employees	
Retail Clerks No. 2	12.00	No. 922	36.76
California State Theatrical		Granite Cutters	24.00
Federation	12.00	Hospital and Institutional	
Candy and Glace Fruit Work-		Workers No. 250	312.00
ers No. 158	336.00	Hotel and Club Service	
Carpenters No. 22	801.00	Workers No. 283	1,449.53
Carpenters and Joiners		Ice Wagon Drivers No. 440	24.00
No. 483	457.52	Inland Boatman's Union of	
Carpenters and Joiners		the Pacific	144.00
No. 2164	318.52	Insurance Agents No. 52	24.00
Cement Finishers No. 580	125.40	Iron Workers No. 377	96.00
Central California District		Jewelry Workers No. 36	78.00
Council of Lumber and Saw-		Joint Executive Council of	
mill Workers	12.00	Teamsters	12.00
Central Labor Council	12.00	Ladies Garment Cutters	
Chauffeurs No. 265	989.88	No. 213	52.00
Chemical Workers No. 466	24.00	Laundry Wagon Drivers	
City and County Employees		No. 256	240.00
No. 400	96.00	Laundry Workers No. 26	1,248.00
City and County Employees		Leather and Novelty Work-	
No. 747	48.00	ers No. 31	48.00
Civil Service Building Mainte-		Joint Executive Board of Cul-	
nance Employees No. 66-A	362.68	nary and Bartenders	12.00
Cleaning and Dye House		Lumber Clerks and Lumber-	
Workers No. 3010	216.00	men No. 2559	192.00
Cloakmakers No. 8	284.00	Macaroni Workers No. 493	46.20
Commercial Telegraphers		Machinists No. 68	1,595.48
No. 34	240.00	Machinists, Production	
Commission Market Drivers		Workers No. 1327	1,800.00
No. 280	132.00	Mailers No. 18	96.00
Construction and General		Marine Cooks and Stewards	2,400.00
Laborers No. 261	533.68	Marine Engineers	24.00
Cooks No. 44	1,458.00	Marine Firemen	1,200.00
Coopers No. 65	24.00	Master Furniture Guild	
Coppersmiths No. 438	26.00	No. 1285	192.00
Dental Technicians of North-		Masters, Mates and Pilots	
ern California No. 99	36.00	No. 40	78.24
District Council of Iron		Masters, Mates and Pilots	
Workers	24.00	No. 89	24.00
District Council of Painters		Masters, Mates and Pilots	
No. 8	12.00	No. 90	576.00
District Council of Plasterers		Milk Wagon Drivers No. 226	579.52
and Cement Finishers	12.00	Miscellaneous and Wood	
Dressmakers No. 101	396.00	Workers No. 2565	115.20
Electrical Workers No. 6	480.00	Miscellaneous Employees	
Elevator Constructors No. 8	72.00	No. 110	1,241.36
Elevator Operators and Start-		Molders and Foundry Work-	
ers No. 117	84.00	ers No. 164	156.00
Federal Naval Fire Fighters		Motion Picture Projectionists	
No. F-52	24.00	No. 162	84.24
Fire Fighters No. 798	757.99		

STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

161

[illegible]

OFFICERS REPORTS TO

Cement Laborers No. 270	1,156.88
Cement Masons No. 25	174.04
Central Labor Council	12.00
Chemical Workers No. 294	112.00
City Employees No. 1058	81.32
Clay and Tile Products No. 994	27.80
District Council of Carpenters..	12.00
District Council of Painters No. 33	12.00
Electrical Workers No. 332.....	84.00
Federal Fire Fighters No. F-36..	24.00
Fire Fighters No. 873	86.92
Freight, Construction, and General Drivers No. 287.....	576.00
Glass Bottle Blowers Association No. 267	9.56
Hod Carriers No. 234	113.64
Hotel, Restaurant, and Hotel Service Employees No. 180....	1,477.08
Insurance Agents No. 194	20.00
Lathers No. 144	48.00
Laundry Workers No. 33	204.00
Lumber and Planing Mill Workers No. 3102	110.60
Machinists No. 504	1,738.96
Millmen No. 262	206.08
Motion Picture Projectionists No. 431	24.00
Musicians No. 153	24.00
Operative Potters No. 168	29.04
Painters No. 507	397.84
Plasterers No. 224	62.40
Plumbers No. 393	120.00
Police Department Em- ployees No. 170	75.88
Printing Pressmen No. 146.....	60.00
Public Employees of Santa Clara County No. 1409.....	48.00
Retail Clerks No. 428	792.00
Roofers No. 95	67.20
Sales Delivery Drivers and Warehousemen No. 296	414.64
Sheet Metal Workers No. 309....	203.44
Stereotypers and Electro- typers No. 120	24.00
Street Carmen No. 265	24.00
Teachers No. 957	30.00
Teamsters Automotive Work- ers No. 576	165.92
Theatrical Stage Employees No. 134	18.00
Typographical No. 231	72.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 14,144.68

SAN JUAN BAUTISTA

United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum No. 143	\$ 72.12
--	----------

SAN LEANDRO

Teachers No. 1285	\$ 6.00
-------------------------	---------

SAN LUIS OBISPO

Barbers No. 767.....	\$ 24.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1632	81.00
Central Labor Council	16.00
Construction and General Laborers No. 1464	20.00
Painters No. 1336	23.48
Plumbers and Steamfitters No. 403	48.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 212.48

SAN MATEO

Bartenders and Culinary Workers No. 340	\$ 1,248.00
Building and Construction Trades Council	12.00
Butchers No. 516	317.60
Carpenters No. 162	510.44
Cement Finishers No. 583.....	24.00
Central Labor Council	12.00
Construction and General Laborers No. 389	702.56
County Employees No. 829	138.68
Electrical Workers No. 617.....	48.00
Hod Carriers No. 97.....	29.00
Lathers No. 278	23.40
Laundry Workers No. 3011	72.00
Machinists No. 1414	96.00
Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Makers No. 1053	148.40
Painters and Decorators No. 913	222.53
Plasterers No. 381	55.20
Plumbers No. 467	24.00
Printing Pressmen No. 315.....	31.20
Retail Clerks No. 775	240.00
Sheet Metal Workers No. 272	24.00
Theatrical Stage Employees No. 409	26.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 4,005.01

SAN PABLO

International Fire Fighters No. 1136	\$ 24.00
---	----------

SAN PEDRO

Auto Machinists No. 1484	\$ 220.88
Barbers No. 881	48.00
Bartenders No. 591	192.00
Butchers No. 551	1,261.00
Carpenters No. 1140	398.00
Central Labor Council	6.00
Chemical Workers No. 53.....	27.80
Culinary Alliance No. 754.....	236.40
Lathers No. 366	30.28
Lumber and Sawmill Work- ers No. 1407	240.00
Masters, Mates and Pilots No. 18	29.68
Painters No. 949	148.66

Pile Drivers No. 2375	240.00
Plasterers and Cement Fin- ishers No. 838	156.00
Retail Clerks No. 905	1,064.92
Seine and Line Fishermen	132.00
Shipyard Laborers No. 802.....	327.00
Typographical No. 862	40.36
Waitresses No. 512	307.36
	<hr/>
	\$ 5,106.34

SAN QUENTIN

San Quentin Prison Em- ployees No. 416.....	\$ 22.00
--	----------

SAN RAFAEL

Barbers No. 582.....	\$ 40.72
Bartenders and Culinary Workers No. 126	447.96
Building and Construction Trades Council	12.00
California State Council of Lathers	12.00
Central Labor Council	12.00
General Truck Drivers No. 624	764.52
Golden Gate District Council of Lathers	12.00
Hod Carriers and General Laborers No. 291	456.00
Lathers No. 268	24.00
Machinists No. 238	233.44
Plasterers and Cement Fin- ishers No. 355	46.52
Retail Clerks No. 1119	307.56
Teachers No. 1077.....	19.32
	<hr/>
	\$ 2,388.04

SANTA ANA

Barbers No. 549	\$ 26.68
Beet Sugar Workers No. 20748..	89.40
Building and Construction Trades Council	12.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1815	882.32
Cement Masons No. 52	148.80
Central Labor Council	12.00
Chemical Workers No. 66	120.28
Chiropractic Professional No. 364	7.00
District Council of Carpenters..	10.00
Electrical Workers No. 441.....	120.00
Glass Bottle Blowers Asso- ciation No. 228	8.00
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 263....	55.24
Hod Carriers and General Laborers No. 652	1,319.24
Lathers No. 440	120.00
Musicians No. 7	5.00
Painters and Decorators No. 686	448.92
Plasterers and Cement Fin- ishers No. 489	192.00

Plumbers and Steamfitters No. 582	144.00
Printing Pressmen No. 166.....	24.00
Roofers No. 36C	63.76
Theatrical Stage Employees No. 504	12.00
Typographical No. 579	50.40
	<hr/>
	\$ 3,871.04

SANTA BARBARA

Barbers No. 832.....	\$ 29.12
Building and Construction Trades Council	12.00
California State Conference of Painters	12.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1062	372.00
Carpet and Linoleum Work- ers No. 1689	24.05
Central Labor Council	12.00
Chauffeurs and Teamsters No. 186	440.00
Construction and General Laborers No. 591	309.48
Culinary Alliance and Bar- tenders No. 498	853.10
District Council of Painters No. 52	12.00
Electrical Workers No. 413.....	60.00
Hod Carriers and General Laborers No. 195	33.40
Lathers No. 379	24.00
Meat Cutters No. 556	204.00
Musicians Protective Asso- ciation No. 308	110.40
Painters No. 715	113.84
Plasterers and Cement Fin- ishers No. 341	36.00
Post Office Clerks No. 264.....	28.80
Retail Clerks No. 899.....	556.28
Plumbers and Steamfitters No. 114	38.40
Roofers No. 137	20.00
Sheet Metal Workers No. 273....	72.56
Theatrical Stage Employees and Motion Picture Oper- ators No. 442	24.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 3,397.43

SANTA CLARA

California State Council of Roofers	\$ 12.00
City Employees No. 107	54.80
Fire Fighters No. 1171	24.00
Glass Bottle Blowers No. 262....	96.36
United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum No. 334	41.80
	<hr/>
	\$ 228.96

OFFICERS REPORTS TO

SANTA CRUZ

Barbers No. 891	\$ 24.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 829	28.80
Central Labor Council	12.00
Construction and General Laborers No. 283	142.00
Electrical Workers No. 609.....	24.00
Leather Workers No. L-122.....	31.44
Painters and Decorators No. 1026	28.50
Plasterers and Cement Fin- ishers No. 379	26.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 316.74

SANTA MARIA

Barbers No. 941	\$ 24.00
Carpenters and Joiners No. 2477	86.00
Central Labor Council	18.00
Chemical Workers No. 224.....	31.68
City Employees No. 1224	26.00
Construction, General, and Oil Field Laborers No. 1222..	154.48
Culinary Workers and Bar- tenders No. 703	322.84
Food Packers, Processors, and Warehousemen No. 865	392.84
Painters No. 1147	38.00
Teachers No. 1297	16.00
Teamsters No. 381	353.24
	<hr/>
	\$ 1,463.08

SANTA MONICA

Barbers No. 573	\$ 72.20
Carpenters and Joiners No. 1400	422.20
Culinary Workers and Bar- tenders No. 814	1,680.00
Fire Fighters No. 1109	31.68
Meat Cutters No. 587	384.00
Painters No. 821	192.52
Plasterers and Cement Masons No. 400	8.80
Plumbers No. 545	208.80
Printing Pressmen No. 429.....	24.00
Retail Clerks No. 1442	1,100.00
Typographical No. 875	28.40
	<hr/>
	\$ 4,152.60

SANTA ROSA

Barbers No. 159	\$ 30.00
Bartenders and Culinary Workers No. 770	491.20
Boot and Shoe Workers No. 446	48.87
Building and Construction Trades Council	12.00
Butchers No. 364	290.16
Central Labor Council	24.00
Electrical Workers No. 551.....	96.00

Fire Fighters No. 1050	6.00
General Truck Drivers No. 980..	821.52
Hod Carriers and Laborers No. 139	312.00
Lathers No. 243	36.00
Motion Picture Operators No. 420	24.00
Musicians No. 292	155.84
Painters No. 364	51.92
Plasterers and Cement Fin- ishers No. 363	40.00
Printing Pressmen No. 354	24.00
Retail Clerks No. 1532.....	296.24
Typographical No. 577	24.24

\$ 2,783.99

SAUGUS

Glass Bottle Blowers No. 69.....	\$ 78.72
----------------------------------	----------

SAWTELLE

Federal Fire Fighters (Vet- erans Administration) No. 16	\$ 8.00
--	---------

SEAL BEACH

Chemical Workers No. 225.....	\$ 24.00
-------------------------------	----------

SEASIDE

Fire Fighters No. 1218.....	\$ 24.00
-----------------------------	----------

SEBASTOPOL

Cannery, Food Process Work- ers and Warehousemen No. 22	\$ 40.52
---	----------

SELMA

Carpenters and Joiners No. 1004	\$ 62.24
--	----------

SIGNAL HILL

Fire Fighters No. 1221	\$ 24.00
------------------------------	----------

SONOMA

California State Employees No. 14	\$ 42.80
--	----------

SONORA

Carpenters and Joiners No. 2196	\$ 53.88
--	----------

SOUTHGATE

Fire Fighters No. 810	\$ 5.00
Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers No. 253	48.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 53.00

SPRECKELS

Sugar Refinery Workers No. 20616	\$ 210.76
---	-----------

STANDARD	
Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2653.....	\$ 273.40
<hr/>	
STOCKTON	
Automotive Machinists	
No. 428	\$ 288.00
Bakers No. 120	83.80
Barbers No. 312	24.00
Bartenders No. 47	210.24
Brick and Clay Workers	
No. 874	41.64
Building and Construction	
Trades Council	12.00
Building Service Employees	
No. 24	48.00
Butchers No. 127	469.32
Cannery Warehousemen, Food Processors, and Drivers	
No. 601	270.00
Carpenters and Joiners	
No. 266	240.00
Carpenters and Joiners	
No. 2891	157.50
Cement Finishers No. 814.....	26.00
Central Labor Council	12.00
Chauffeurs and Teamsters	
No. 439	896.00
City Employees No. 102.....	95.40
County Employees No. 183.....	24.00
Culinary Alliance No. 572.....	633.56
District Council of Carpenters of San Joaquin County.....	12.00
Electrical Workers No. 591.....	48.00
Fire Fighters No. 1229.....	50.48
Fire Fighters No. 1243.....	24.00
Hod Carriers and Common Laborers No. 73	330.00
Machinists No. 364	244.36
Motion Picture Projectionists	
No. 428	24.00
Motor Coach Operators	
No. 276	27.16
Musicians No. 189	104.00
Office Employees No. 26	24.00
Operative Potters No. 171	27.32
Painters No. 1115	173.00
Paper Makers No. 320	199.92
Plasterers No. 222	24.00
Plumbers and Steamfitters	
No. 492	77.04
Post Office Clerks No. 320.....	44.36
Retail Clerks No. 197.....	120.00
Sheet Metal Workers No. 283....	44.00
Theatrical Stage Employees	
No. 90	24.00
Typographical No. 56	40.80
	<hr/>
	\$ 5,193.90

SUNNYVALE

Theatrical Stage and Motion Picture Operators No. 796.....	\$ 24.00
--	----------

SUSANVILLE

Barbers and Beauticians	
No. 311	\$ 42.00
Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 3033	105.36
Tri-County Central Labor Council	12.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 159.36

TAFT

Barbers No. 869	\$ 24.00
Painters and Decorators	
No. 702	14.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 38.00

TERMINAL ISLAND

Cannery Workers of the Pacific	\$ 1,800.00
--------------------------------------	-------------

TORRANCE

Boilermakers No. 718	\$ 24.00
Chemical Workers No. 138	47.48
Chemical Workers No. 598.....	24.12
Fire Fighters No. 1138.....	29.36
Machinists No. 1619	22.00
Operative Potters No. 218.....	66.16
	<hr/>
	\$ 213.12

TRACY

Carpenters and Joiners	
No. 1698	\$ 34.60
Sugar Workers No. 20058.....	95.56
	<hr/>
	\$ 130.16

TRINIDAD

Loggers No. 3006	\$ 195.60
------------------------	-----------

TULARE

Carpenters and Joiners	
No. 1578	\$ 26.20

TUOLUMNE

Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2810	\$ 124.44
---	-----------

TURLOCK

Carpenters and Joiners	
No. 1306	\$ 39.20

UKIAH

California State Employees	
No. 519	\$ 24.00
Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 2975	98.80
North Coast Counties District Council of Carpenters	6.00
Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers No. 723	218.92
	<hr/>
	\$ 347.72

VALLEJO

American Federation of	
Grain Millers No. 71	\$ 69.04
Asbestos Workers No. 70	26.00
Barbers No. 335	89.84
Boilermakers No. 148	91.96
Building and Construction	
Trades Council	9.00
Butchers and Meat Cutters	
No. 532	331.20
Carpenters and Joiners	
No. 180	308.00
Central Labor Council	12.00
Culinary Workers and Bar-	
tenders No. 560	330.28
Electrical Workers No. 180.....	96.00
Fire Fighters No. 1186	26.12
Hod Carriers and General	
Laborers No. 326	270.12
Lathers No. 302	24.00
Laundry Workers No. 113	53.88
Mare Island Navy Yards	
Metal Trades Council	9.00
Musicians No. 367	78.00
Operating Engineers No. 731....	80.44
Painters No. 376	84.00
Plasterers and Cement Fin-	
ishers No. 631	36.00
Plumbers No. 343	35.20
Retail Clerks No. 373	480.00
Roofers No. 35	22.24
Sheet Metal Workers No. 75.....	84.00
Sheet Metal Workers No. 221....	28.80
Shipwrights, Joiners and	
Shipbuilders No. 1068	37.44
Teachers No. 827	24.00
Teamsters and Chauffeurs	
No. 490	363.76
Technical Engineers Naval	
Shipyards No. 8.....	50.04
Theatrical Stage Employees	
No. 241	24.00
Typographical No. 389	64.80
	<hr/>
	\$ 3,239.16

VALLEY SPRINGS

Lumber and Sawmill Work-	
ers No. 2847	\$ 33.64

VAN NUYS

Barbers No. 837	\$ 81.60
Carpenters and Joiners	
No. 1913	1,110.76
Painters No. 1595	365.36
Post Office Clerks No. 1159.....	24.00
Bricklayers and Stone Masons	
No. 26	13.08
	<hr/>
	\$ 1,594.80

VENTURA

Building and Construction	
Trades Council	\$ 12.00

Carpenters and Joiners

No. 2463	260.37
Central Labor Council	12.00
District Council of Carpenters..	13.00
Electrical Workers No. 952.....	120.00
Hod Carriers and General	
Laborers No. 585.....	440.52
Lathers No. 460	24.00
Operating Engineers No. 732....	20.00
Painters and Decorators	
No. 955	117.50
Plasterers and Cement Fin-	
ishers No. 741	55.00
Plumbers and Steamfitters	
No. 484	86.40
	<hr/>
	\$ 1,160.79

VERNON

Glass Bottle Blowers No. 224...\$	72.00
Paper Makers No. 336	24.00
Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper	
Mill Workers No. 254.....	36.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 132.00

VICTORVILLE

United Cement, Lime, and	
Gypsum Workers No. 49.....\$	191.68

VISALIA

Barbers No. 856	\$ 24.00
Building and Construction	
Trades Council	12.00
Carpenters No. 1484	118.28
Central Labor Council	12.00
Hod Carriers and General	
Laborers No. 1060	176.00
Lathers No. 449	24.00
Stage Employees and Motion	
Picture Operators No. 605.....	24.00
Plasterers and Cement Masons	
No. 895	12.00
Teamsters No. 94	372.24
Typographical No. 519	24.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 798.52

VISTA

Carpenters No. 2078	\$ 363.60
Lathers No. 527	24.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 387.60

WARM SPRINGS

Brick and Clay Workers	
No. 663	\$ 16.00

WATSONVILLE

Barbers No. 749	\$ 24.00
Brick and Clay Workers	
No. 998	51.88
Carpenters and Joiners	
No. 771	61.44

Central Labor Council	12.00	WHITE PINES	
Culinary Workers and Bar-		Lumber and Sawmill Work-	
tenders No. 345	165.56	ers No. 2538	\$ 40.00
Electrical Workers No. 526.....	24.00		
Fire Fighters of Santa Cruz		WHITTIER	
County No. 1272	24.00	Typographical No. 899	\$ 30.00
General Teamsters, Packers,			
and Warehousemen No. 912..	320.00	WILMINGTON	
Lathers No. 122	24.00	Amusement Guild	\$ 24.00
Machinists No. 1939	24.00	Chemical Workers No. 40	131.52
Railway Carmen No. 765	26.96	Inlandboatmen of the Pacific...	90.76
Theatrical Stage Employees		Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper	
No. 611	24.00	Mill Workers No. 341.....	73.92
Typographical No. 543	24.00	Seafarers, Atlantic and Gulf	
	\$ 805.84	District	130.00
		Ship Carpenters No. 1335	144.00
			\$ 594.20
WEED			
Lumber and Sawmill Work-			
ers No. 2907	\$ 359.44	WOODLAND	
		Beet Sugar Operators	
WEIMAR		No. 20610	\$ 156.56
Weimar Sanatorium Em-		United Sugar Workers Council..	12.00
ployees No. 745	\$ 118.84		
			\$ 168.56
WESTEND			
Chemical Workers No. 398.....	\$ 121.68		
WEST POINT		Total Per Capita Receipts and	
Lumber and Sawmill Work-		Affiliation Fees—Year Ended	
ers No. 2694	\$ 84.08	June 30, 1958—Exhibit B.....	\$360,603.48

Schedule 2—Detail of Per Capita Receipts and Affiliation Fees by Districts Year ended June 30, 1958

District No. 1:		Bell	101.76
Brawley	\$ 86.64	Burbank	2,212.88
Chula Vista	24.00	Colton	324.36
Coronado	24.00	Corona	97.24
El Cajon	260.80	Culver City	43.40
El Centro	313.80	El Monte	2,288.05
La Jolla	108.80	Fontana	25.00
Palm City	60.48	Glendale	2,631.98
San Diego	15,557.94	Hollywood	12,304.10
Vista	387.60	Huntington Park	2,025.25
		Lakewood	24.00
	\$ 16,824.06	Lancaster	321.56
District No. 2:		Los Angeles	71,587.87
Anaheim	\$ 829.80	Los Nietos	118.92
Compton	723.40	Lynwood	8.00
Fullerton	35.12	Maywood	254.20
Long Beach	11,556.35	Mentone	16.00
Orange	481.00	Monrovia	576.52
Santa Ana	3,871.04	Norwalk	50.08
Seal Beach	24.00	Olive View	96.00
Signal Hill	24.00	Ontario	93.00
	\$ 17,544.71	Oro Grande	144.53
District No. 3:		Palmdale	116.52
Alhambra	\$ 245.00	Palm Springs	312.12
Avalon	24.00	Pasadena	3,583.08
Azusa	24.00	Patton	26.00
Barstow	146.76	Pomona	2,875.58
		Quartz Hill	20.28
		Redlands	182.38

OFFICERS REPORTS TO

Reseda	803.36
Riverside	2,875.67
San Bernardino	5,210.82
San Fernando	48.00
San Gabriel	58.96
Saugus	78.72
Sawtelle	8.00
Southgate	53.00
Van Nuys	1,594.80
Vernon	132.00
Victorville	191.68
Westend	121.68
Whittier	30.00

\$114,107.11

District No. 4:

Inglewood	\$ 1,200.96
Redondo Beach	659.72
San Pedro	5,106.34
Santa Monica	4,152.60
Terminal Island	1,800.00
Torrance	213.12
Wilmington	594.20

\$ 13,726.94

District No. 5:

Betteravia	\$ 107.70
Lompoc	161.32
Ojai	24.00
Oxnard	186.40
San Luis Obispo	212.48
Santa Barbara	3,397.43
Santa Maria	1,463.08
Ventura	1,160.79

\$ 6,713.20

District No. 6:

Bakersfield	\$ 3,426.80
Bishop	35.44
Boron	261.68
China Lake	24.00
Fresno	8,180.60
Hanford	62.90
Kingsburg	71.08
Los Banos	19.00
Madera	34.00
Merced	309.74
Mojave	106.60
North Fork	83.36
Porterville	43.40
Selma	62.24
Taft	38.00
Tulare	26.20
Visalia	798.52
White Pines	40.00

\$ 13,623.56

District No. 7:

Lodi	\$ 118.24
Manteca	76.52
Martell	24.00
Modesto	2,704.84

San Andreas	23.44
Sonora	53.88
Standard	273.40
Stockton	5,193.90
Tracy	130.16
Tuolumne	124.44
Turlock	39.20
Valley Springs	33.64
West Point	84.08

\$ 8,879.74

District No. 8:

Agnew	\$ 8.32
Colma	72.00
Cupertino	69.76
Davenport	57.60
Gilroy	26.00
Los Altos	24.00
Los Gatos	180.72
Monterey	1,490.08
Mountain View	719.28
Palo Alto	777.14
Redwood City	283.60
Salinas	1,266.68
San Bruno	160.00
San Jose	14,144.68
San Juan Bautista	72.12
San Mateo	4,005.01
Santa Clara	228.96
Santa Cruz	316.74
Seaside	24.00
Spreckels	210.76
Sunnyvale	24.00
Watsonville	805.84

\$ 24,967.29

District No. 9:

Honolulu, T. H.	\$ 65.60
San Francisco	63,593.94

\$ 63,659.54

District No. 10:

Alameda	\$ 134.56
Alvarado	84.08
Berkeley	371.16
Decoto	46.68
Hayward	2,072.89
Newark	105.84
Oakland	34,144.14
San Leandro	6.00
Warm Springs	16.00

\$ 36,981.35

District No. 11:

Antioch	\$ 449.92
Concord	308.08
Crockett	527.32
El Cerrito	155.40
Lafayette	24.00
Martinez	2,393.00
Pittsburg	769.62
Port Chicago	60.08

STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

169

Richmond	3,697.50
San Pablo	24.00
	<hr/>
	\$ 8,408.92

District No. 12:

Benicia	\$ 119.52
Cazadero	6.00
Mare Island	28.12
Mill Valley	114.64
Napa	913.08
Petaluma	256.76
San Quentin	22.00
San Rafael	2,388.04
Santa Rosa	2,783.99
Sebastopol	40.52
Sonoma	42.80
Vallejo	3,239.16
	<hr/>

\$ 9,954.63

District No. 13:

Auburn	\$ 37.28
Bijou	59.76
Camino	61.40
Chico	741.16
Clarksburg	66.80
Diamond Springs	24.44
Edwards	10.00
Feather Falls	123.52
Fresh Pond	120.20
Grass Valley	356.04
Gridley	24.00
Marysville	960.16
Omo Ranch	41.80

Oroville	769.44
Placerville	96.28
Roseville	417.28
Sacramento	13,922.39
Weimar	118.84
Woodland	168.56
	<hr/>

\$ 18,119.35

District No. 14:

Arcata	\$ 483.68
Eureka	2,096.16
Fort Bragg	24.72
Klamath	205.82
Myers Flat	8.00
Red Bluff	121.00
Trinidad	195.60
Ukiah	347.72
	<hr/>

\$ 3,482.70

District No. 15:

Chester	\$ 157.12
Greenville	117.44
Loyalton	85.20
Quincy	125.44
Redding	2,584.38
Reno, Nevada	22.00
Susanville	159.36
Weed	359.44
	<hr/>

\$ 3,610.38

**Total Per Capita Receipts and
Affiliation Fees—Year Ended
June 30, 1958—Exhibit B.....\$360,603.48**

Schedule 3—Detail of Disbursements Year ended June 30, 1958

A.F.L.-C.I.O. CONVENTION AND CONFERENCE:

Allowances and expenses of officers:

Haggerty, C. J., Secretary-Treasurer	\$ 1,000.00
Pitts, Thomas L., President	1,000.00
	<hr/>

\$ 2,000.00

Other expenses:

Western Air Lines	2,003.43
	<hr/>

Total \$ 4,003.43

55TH ANNUAL CONVENTION— OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA:

Salaries:

Faltus, Thelma	\$ 61.73
Grigsby, Evelyn	131.55
Kennedy, Diana	172.32
Kennedy, Evelyn	308.80
London, Joan	636.62
Petrone, Geraldine	130.82
	<hr/>

1,441.84

Allowances and expenses of officers and employees:

Haggerty, C. J., Secretary-Treasurer	\$ 500.00
--	-----------

Henning, John F.	350.00
Hines, Charles A.	350.00
Hyans, Curtis J.	150.00
Nugent, Thomas	175.00
Otto, Walter R.	350.00
Pitts, Thomas L., President	500.00
Vial, Donald	28.50

\$ 2,403.50

Other expenses:

The Garrett Press—printing	\$32,265.95
Irvine & Jachens, Inc.—badges	2,815.80
Blake, Moffitt & Towne	39.42
Clarence Boragno—hauling	25.00
Petty cash—Credentials Committee	700.00
Petty cash—Resolutions Committee	910.00
Petty cash—Legislation Committee	770.00
Petty cash—Constitution Committee	840.00
Petty cash—Sergeants at Arms	1,365.00
Hotel Leamington	1,084.76
Central Labor Council, Alameda County.....	619.08
Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.	126.68
Audograph, Inc.	14.04
E. D. Conklin—reporting and transcribing	2,531.34
Petty cash—miscellaneous	803.80

44,910.87

Total

\$ 48,756.21

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETINGS:**Allowances and expenses of officers
and employees:****Regular meetings:**

Arnold, Jack	\$ 259.30
Ash, Robert S.	400.00
Callahan, M. R.	106.00
Christian, J. J.	419.89
Dougherty, Arthur F.	419.00
Fillippini, Wilbur	437.09
Finks, Harry	450.00
Gardner, John T.	407.18
Giesick, Robert	675.00
Goldberger, Jack	419.00
Green, C. A.	168.00
Gruhn, Albin J.	403.65
Haggerty, C. J., Secretary-Treasurer	305.00
Henning, John F.	220.00
Hyans, C. J.	70.00
Jones, Paul L.	265.00
Lehmann, C. T.	412.09
Lundschen, Harvey	50.00
Metz, Harry W.	150.00
Nelson, Lowell	436.00
O'Brien, George E.	268.80
O'Hare, Robert J.	455.09
Osslo, Max J.	523.36
Otto, Walter R.	220.00
Petrone, Geraldine	220.00
Pitts, Thomas L., President	250.00
Reed, Howard	441.00
Reeves, Paul L.	50.00
Small, Thomas A.	419.00

STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

171

Smith, James L.	501.98
Somerset, Pat	427.18
Vial, Donald	35.00
Weisberger, Morris	419.00

\$10,702.61

A.F.L.-C.I.O. Merger Meetings:

Finks, Harry	\$ 1,150.00
Goldberger, Jack	1,086.27
Gruhn, Albin J.	949.80
Haggerty, C. J., Secretary-Treasurer	775.00
Henning, John F.	11.24
Nelson, Lowell	1,145.81
O'Hare, Robert J.	608.30
Osslo, Max J.	962.06
Pitts, Thomas L., President	224.50
Small, Thomas A.	1,199.09
Somerset, Pat	659.60

8,771.67

Pension Committee:

Nelson, Lowell	\$ 40.60
Small, Thomas A.	35.00
Weisberger, Morris	35.00

110.60

Other expenses:

Clift Hotel	\$ 572.13
Petty cash	29.45
Hollywood Roosevelt Hotel	265.71
The Garrett Press	130.00
Southern Pacific Co.	92.40
Fairmont Hotel	269.83

1,359.52

Total

\$ 20,944.40

LEGISLATIVE EXPENSES:

Salary:

Finks, Harry	400.00
--------------------	--------

Allowances and expenses of officers and employees:

Finks, Harry	\$ 224.55
Pitts, Thomas L., President	331.06
Vial, Donald	250.00

805.61

Other expenses:

The Garrett Press—printing	\$16,898.69
Sacramento Labor Council	91.25
Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.	27.61
Western Union	77.14
Warren Zimmer	78.00
Sacramento Inn	15.47
Hotel Senator	315.80

17,503.96

Total

18,709.57

ORGANIZING EXPENSES:**Salaries:**

Henning, John F.	\$ 7,685.00
Otto, Walter R.	5,637.50

\$13,322.50

Allowances and expense of officers and employees:

Dougherty, Arthur F.	\$ 400.00
Finks, Harry	785.00
Haggerty, C. J., Secretary-Treasurer	5,870.00
Henning, John F.	420.99
Hyans, Curtis J.	45.00
Small, Thomas A.	317.00

7,837.99

Other expenses:

David Hewes Building—rent	\$ 1,800.00
Five Counties Central Labor Council	1,800.00
California Committee for Fair Employment Practices	100.00
Sacramento Labor Council	243.49
Labor-Management Banquet	100.00
Rehabilitation of Physically Handicapped	350.00
Cadillac Motor Car Division	4,419.74
Flood Garage	362.01
Union Oil Co.	226.36
Western Air Lines	1,443.76
Southern Pacific Co.	43.56
Barbers Local No. 837, Van Nuys	3,000.00
Standard Oil Co.	17.94
State Building and Construction Trades Council	577.50
Occidental Life Insurance Co.—pension.....	4,217.07
Histadrut Dinner Committee	125.00
Hotel Senator	75.68
Kings Photo Service	12.48
Hertz Corporation	24.03
Addressing Machine Company	15.00
Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.	175.25
Petty cash—postage	2,100.00
Petty cash—miscellaneous	199.66

21,428.53

Total

\$ 42,589.02

PUBLICITY EXPENSES:**Salaries:**

Bianchi, Maud	\$ 1,873.19
King, Bert C.	1,924.42
Moore, Josephine	1,873.20
Waiamau, William K.	594.65
Weber, Nan A.	1,457.24

\$ 7,722.70

Other expenses:

David Hewes Building—rent	\$ 1,961.00
John F. Fixa, Postmaster	9,368.80
Blake Moffitt & Towne	3,644.83
The Garrett Press	8,569.18
Golden Gate Press	1,748.04
James H. Barry Co.	869.35

STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

173

Milo Harding Co.	480.49
Duplicating Specialists	51.17
R. V. Webber	20.00
Kielty & Dayton	25.15
Addressograph-Multigraph Corporation	193.00
Petty cash—miscellaneous	103.67

\$27,034.68

Total

\$ 34,757.38

STATISTICAL EXPENSES:

Salaries:

Bailey, Constance	\$ 34.56
Bergeron, Margaret	760.32
Cline, Marjorie E.	48.90
Curtiss, Nadine	155.52
Cusick, Leola	120.96
Faltus, Thelma	425.78
Fivey, Diane	163.00
Grigsby, Evelyn	3,894.32
Kennedy, Diana	4,435.24
Lardman, Teresa	60.48
London, Joan	4,868.54

14,967.62

Allowances and expenses of officers and employees:

Henning, John F.	\$ 22.30
Pitts, Thomas L., President	250.00
Vial, Donald	183.00

455.30

Books, pamphlets, and subscriptions:

California Safety Council	\$ 30.00
Commerce Clearing House	345.00
Congressional Quarterly	120.00
Sacramento Newsletter	50.00
Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D.C.	75.00
West Publishing Co.	165.32
Bancroft-Whitney	146.90
National Information Bureau	25.00
Special Libraries Association	30.00
Standard and Poor's	456.00
International Labor Press	25.00
United States Government Printing Office	100.00
John Herling's Labor Letter	20.00
Los Angeles Times	21.25
Oakland Tribune	16.45
Other books, pamphlets, etc.	618.81

2,244.73

Other expenses:

David Hewes Building—rent	\$ 1,956.00
A.F.L.-C.I.O. Headquarters	120.90
Audograph, Inc.	46.96
Addressing Machine Co.	152.25
Bell Typewriter Co.	146.55
International Business Machines	213.84
Marchant Calculators, Inc.	71.04
Galland Linen Service	66.85
Hodson Photo Co.	17.76
Visual and Industrial Designs—cartoons	131.91

OFFICERS REPORTS TO

Pacific Carbon & Ribbon Co.	139.65
Kielty & Dayton	36.50
Wobbers	63.47
Navajo Freight Lines	7.52
Alhambra National Water Co.	78.65
Press and Union League Club	28.80
General Office Equipment Co.	12.00
Commonwealth Club	42.00
Southern Pacific Company	63.80
The Garrett Press	197.60
Petty cash—miscellaneous	101.61

\$ 3,695.66

Total

\$ 21,363.31

LEGAL EXPENSES:**Salary:**

Vial, Donald \$ 7,992.49

Fees and expenses:
Scully, Charles P. \$31,204.09
Todd, Clarence E. 368.23

31,572.32
Other expenses:
David Hewes Building—rent \$ 1,884.00
Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co. 1,963.20
Occidental Life Insurance Co.—pension..... 4,217.07

8,064.27

Total

\$ 47,629.08

LOS ANGELES OFFICE EXPENSES:**Salaries:**
Hyans, Curtis J. \$ 5,200.00
Kennedy, Margaret 4,422.20
Pitts, Thomas L., President 15,000.00
Vern, Richard E. 243.60

24,865.80
Allowances and expenses of officers and employees:
Hyans, Curtis J. \$ 2,697.40
Pitts, Thomas L., President 5,911.99

8,609.39
Other expenses:
Office Building Associates—rent \$ 3,360.00
Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co. 1,676.95
Western Union 8.27 || Magnetic Springs Water Co. | 72.22 |
The Aldine Co.	214.72
Richfield Oil Co.	319.75
The Texas Co.	606.53
Cadillac Motor Car Division	69.16
George McWaters	4.80
International Business Machines	40.92
Bancroft-Whitney	90.43
George E. Montgomery Co.	10.83

Wheeldex Simpla Co.	4.53
Automobile Club of Southern California	137.00
K and D Press	7.02
Wilson Carbon Co.	11.96
Louis Z. Sartario—court reporter	138.00
H. L. Bryan—tax collector	55.57
Petty cash—postage	116.50
Petty cash—miscellaneous	30.00

 6,975.16

Total

\$ 40,450.35

"RIGHT TO WORK" DEFENSE FUND EXPENSES:**Salaries:**

Bianchi, Maud	\$ 479.15
Kennedy, Diana	14.79
King, Bert C.	785.80
Moore, Josephine	425.78
Otto, Walter R.	41.02
Petrone, Geraldine	26.76
Waia mau, William K.	209.83
Weber, Nan A.	458.22

 \$ 2,441.35
Allowances and expenses of officers and employees:

Finks, Harry	\$ 3,744.90
Henning, John F.	103.33
Knox, John D.	2,482.06
Nelson, Lowell	374.00
Osslo, Max J.	63.46
Pitts, Thomas L., President	26.50
Small, Thomas A.	105.00

 6,899.25
Other expenses:

Charles P. Scully—legal	\$ 208.50
A.F.L.-C.I.O. Headquarters	750.00
R. V. Webber	125.00
Warren W. Zimmer—advertising	625.35
The Garrett Press—printing	60,854.33
Blake, Moffitt & Towne	325.08
Kielty & Dayton	296.64
Western Union	74.75
Olympic Press	26.84
Southern Pacific Co.	107.99
Central Labor Council	150.00
Riverside Ordinance Committee	1,000.00
Copy Service	47.19
King's Photo Service	112.32
Bureau of National Affairs	55.10
Northern Coast Counties District of Carpenters	924.46
General Office Equipment Co.	953.68
Photo Sound Co.	15.00
Hotel Statler	10.00
Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.	1,367.03
Peter Scaulon—janitor	5.00
International Business Machines	154.34
Railway Express Agency	6.14

OFFICERS REPORTS TO

Addressograph-Multigraph Corporation	1,360.51
Consolidated Film Industries	988.94
Regents University of California	5.71
Skinner & Hammond—auditing	340.00
Acme Fast Freight	6.89
Catholic Council on Working Life	216.84
Harry McCune Sound Service	8.00
The Religion and Labor Foundation	60.00
Petty cash—postage	232.49
Petty cash—miscellaneous	124.53

71,538.65

Total

\$ 80,879.25

SCOLARSHIP PROGRAM:

The Garrett Press	529.32
California Association of Secondary School Administrators	13.00
University of California	1,000.00
Bryn Mawr College	500.00
Expenses of scholarship winners	110.00
Wobbers	71.66
Arthur Carsten	61.49
Petty cash—postage	343.05

Total

2,628.52

OFFICE SALARIES:

Dunn, Margaret	4,415.93
Grigsby, Evelyn	81.50
Haggerty, C. J., Secretary-Treasurer	25,008.00
Hines, Charles A.	5,720.00
Kennedy, Evelyn	1,176.00
McManus, Shirley	2,214.97
Petrone, Geraldine	4,722.47
Zito, Marie H.	1,251.04

Total

44,589.91

PRINTING, STATIONERY, AND OFFICE SUPPLIES:

The Garrett Press	2,777.22
Duplicating Specialists	2.33
Milo Harding Co.	6.24
Addressing Machine Co.	193.57
Banco Corporation	56.97
Kielty & Dayton	77.30
Wobbers	9.47
Bell Typewriter Co.	70.42
Galland Linen Service	38.20
James H. Barry Co.	946.90
Morgan and Barclay	6.06
Schwabacher-Frey	5.80
Magnetic Springs Water Co.	7.82
Pacific Carbon and Ribbon Co.	16.23
General Office Equipment Co.	5.05

Total

4,219.58

OFFICE RENT—GENERAL:

David Hewes Building

2,304.00

POSTAGE AND MAILING—GENERAL:

Pitney-Bowes, Inc.	\$ 221.19	
Petty cash—postage	2,201.57	
	<hr/>	
Total		\$ 2,422.76

TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH—GENERAL:

Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.	2,138.41	
Western Union	553.85	
	<hr/>	
Total		2,692.26

TAXES:

Federal Reserve Bank—social security taxes	1,146.27	
Director of Internal Revenue—social security taxes	619.04	
Department of Employment	166.33	
City and County of San Francisco—personal property taxes	153.30	
	<hr/>	
Total		2,084.94

GENERAL EXPENSES:

Office Employees Insurance Trust Fund	2,468.35	
James F. Allen—insurance	112.50	
Benedetti Floral Co.	327.10	
Burns, The Florist	26.00	
Bekins Van & Storage—record storage	121.90	
Lichtenberger-Ferguson Co.	88.41	
Occidental Life Insurance Co.—pension	4,217.08	
Maloney & Maritzen—insurance	498.71	
Skinner & Hammond—auditing	3,955.00	
George Arabian	10.30	
Union Label Section	100.00	
Vacation expense allowances:		
Haggerty, C. J., Secretary-Treasurer	2,000.00	
Pitts, Thomas L., President	2,000.00	
Alhambra National Water Co.	27.95	
Galland Linen Service	9.55	
Sacramento Labor Council	37.73	
Bell Typewriter Co.	62.60	
State Compensation Insurance Fund	157.45	
George McWaters—insurance	330.94	
Arthur F. Dougherty—expenses	300.00	
David Hewes Building—repairs	15.25	
The Garrett Press—pension program material	450.84	
Martin E. Segal—pension program review	2,000.00	
Widows & Orphans Ball	5.00	
The Hibernia Bank	5.50	
Universal Carloading	50.38	
Petty cash—Christmas gifts	580.00	
Petty cash—miscellaneous	545.30	
	<hr/>	
Total		20,503.84

QUARTERLY INSTITUTE EXPENSES:**Allowances and expenses:**

Henning, John F.	\$ 315.00
Hyans, Curtis J.	55.08
	<hr/>

370.08

OFFICERS REPORTS TO

Other expenses:

Fresno Hacienda	\$ 227.12
Santa Barbara Biltmore	258.57
Carrillo Hotel	59.03
E. D. Conklin	88.50
Southern Pacific Company	63.80
Western Union	5.66
Culinary Alliance No. 498	75.00
Labor Press Conference	895.78
Health and Welfare Conference	1,052.23

\$ 2,725.69

Total

\$ 3,095.77

TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS—Exhibit B

\$444,623.58

Fraternally submitted,

C. J. HAGGERTY
Secretary-Treasurer

CALIFORNIA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR

1901 — 1958

Presidents

1901	Cecil D. Rogers, Typographical No. 36, Oakland.
1902, 1903	John Davidson, Ship Joiners No. 9, Vallejo.
1904, 1905	Harry A. Knox, Street Carmen No. 205, San Francisco.
1906	G. S. Brower, Carpenters No. 483, San Francisco.
1906	Thomas F. Gallagher, Team Drivers No. 70, Oakland.
1907-1908	George A. Tracy, Typographical No. 21, San Francisco.
1908-1909	Alexander M. Thompson, Team Drivers No. 70, Oakland.
1909-1912	Daniel D. Sullivan, Printing Pressmen No. 60, Sacramento.
1912-1916	Daniel P. Haggerty, Machinists No. 68, San Francisco.
1916-1921	Daniel C. Murphy, Web Pressmen No. 4, San Francisco.
1921-1924	Seth R. Brown, Typographical No. 174, Los Angeles.
1924-1926	Roe H. Baker, Barbers No. 148, San Francisco.
1926-1928	John F. Dalton, Typographical No. 174, Los Angeles.
1928-1930	William P. Stanton, Electrical Workers No. 151, San Francisco.
1930-1934	A. W. Hoch, Machinists No. 311, Los Angeles.
1934-1936	Edward D. Vandeleur, Street Railway Employees, Div. 518, San Francisco.
1936-1937	James E. Hopkins, Teamsters No. 85, San Francisco.
1937-1943	C. J. Haggerty, Lathers No. 42, Los Angeles.
1943-1946	Anthony L. Noriega, Motion Picture Projectionists No. 162, San Francisco.
1946-1947	Charles W. Real, Teamsters No. 70, Oakland.
1947-1950	John F. Shelley, Bakery Wagon Drivers No. 484, San Francisco.
1950-1958	Thomas L. Pitts, Wholesale Delivery Drivers No. 848, Los Angeles.

Secretaries

1901, 1902	Guy Lathrop, Carpenters No. 483, San Francisco.
1903	George K. Smith, Barbers No. 134, Oakland.
1904	George B. Benham, Printing Pressmen No. 24, San Francisco.
1905	Frank J. Bonnington, Typographical No. 21, San Francisco.
1906, 1907	James H. Bowling, Street Carmen No. 205, San Francisco.
1908-1909	George W. Bell, Gas Workers No. 9840, San Francisco.
1909-1936	Paul Scharrenberg, Sailors' Union of the Pacific, San Francisco.
1936-1943	Edward D. Vandeleur, Street Railway Employees, Div. 518, San Francisco.
1943-1958	C. J. Haggerty, Lathers No. 42, Los Angeles.