On January 11, 1973, President Nixon abolished Phase II and began Phase III. Phase III is based on voluntary cooperation with a threat that those who don't abide by the program will get clobbered. As usual, the Nixon Administration announcement was vague and uncertain.

A summary of Phase III rules are as follows:

1. The President has established a goal to reduce the rate of inflation further in 1973, to 2 1/2% or below by the end of 1973.

2. Except in special areas (food, health, construction industry and interest and dividends), the present program will be replaced by one which is self-administering and based on voluntary compliance.

3. The Pay Board and Price Commission have been abolished. Pay and Price divisions have been established in the Cost of Living Council.

4. The Labor-Management Advisory Committee is being established. This Committee is to advise the Cost of Living Council on whether the standards should be modified and if so, how. However, for the time being the 5.5% standard will be used as the guide.

5. With the exception of units subject to special rules or exceptions:—All employee units of 1,000 or more will be required to keep records of wage-rate changes. They will have the obligation of producing these upon request.

6. The Cost of Living Council reserves the authority to establish mandatory standards where necessary to assure that future action in a particular industry is consistent with the national goal.

7. A one year extension of the present Economic Stabilization Act is being requested by the Nixon Administration.

**Pension Benefits**

PART I

When Union brothers retire they are faced with a substantial reduction in income. Some retirees are able to supplement social security through their savings or through part-time employment. Most, however, would have nothing but their social security benefits were it not for the development of negotiated pension plans. The major purpose of pension plans, therefore, is to supplement social security, enabling the employee to retire with dignity and with a reasonable standard of living in retirement.

Pension plans involve substantial costs today because they require the setting aside of money to keep a promise in the future, i.e., when the worker retires. Because a pension program sets aside money now for the setting aside of money to keep a promise in the future, i.e., when the worker retires, it is to supplement social security, enabling the employee to retire with dignity and with a reasonable standard of living in retirement.

Pension plans involve substantial costs today because they require the setting aside of money to keep a promise in the future, i.e., when the worker retires. Because a pension program sets aside money now for the future, certain assumptions must be made as to what will happen in the future. These assumptions are nothing more than educated guesses as to future mortality rates, future interest rates, future turnover rates, estimated future retirement ages and other factors.

An example—Using life expectancy tables it is assumed that a worker aged 65 will live on the average of 15 years or 180 months. In order to provide $1.00 per month pension, a total amount of $180.00 would be needed. This will be difficult for many to accept.

The year ahead appears to be one in which Labor will be faced with a number of problems. Local 1245 will have its share and the outlook means increased work for both Officers and Staff.

Many of these problems are being created by stepped-up activities of governmental bodies into collective bargaining areas, which create the necessity to modify past practices. The dictation in resolution of issues not in conformity with the grievance procedure infringes on the rights of both Union and Company. The problems are diverting time and effort from primary objectives of the Union and have created the need to review contract provisions, apprentice and training programs, job definitions, etc., which would not be part of the negotiations this year.

We are in a defensive position due to court decisions and decrees by governmental bodies and this must be remedied. Without quarreling over the merits of the laws or the decisions, it is obvious that we must assess the risks and we will have to make some changes to accommodate to the new order. This will be difficult for many to accept.

We are watching closely all identifiable problem areas. Each new field, be it raised by the Internal Revenue Service, Equal Opportunity Commission, Fair Employment Practices Commission, or under the Equal Rights Amendment, is being studied and we are seeking solutions to reduce the impact of the changes which we believe we must eventually make.

Hopefully, cooperation in making modifications in areas where we know we are vulnerable will result in avoidance of loss of basic concepts now in the agreement. This could result if we stand pat and wait for court orders which could give us no latitude in determination of affects and no means to modify the result.

On the economic issues, we are again facing new unknowns with the announcement that Phase III is now in effect. We will have to watch closely the new round of bargaining in the major contract openings of basic industries to see how things shape up. First impressions by most economists do not appear very encouraging on the new program of so-called voluntary compliance.

Wage restraints should be effective in that the economic motivations for employers to be police men under the program are greater than Phase II. Price controls have (Continued on Page Seven)
Right to work or freeload?

A Florida retiree and President of the Retired Brothers of Local 328, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, wanted to express his feelings on that state’s right-to-work law to his state representative. He found that the best way to do it was to tell him of the writing of a trade union friend who explained his opposition to the compulsory open shop law in these words:

“I don’t want a ‘right-to-work’ law, but if there is instituted such a law in this state, there are a few other things I would like to have included in it:

• If I were a businessman, I want to use all the facilities of the Chamber of Commerce and the Retailers Association without belonging to them or paying any dues or fees to them.

• If I were a manufacturer, I want to use the facilities of the National Manufacturers Association without cost.

• If I were a doctor, I would want to be free to practice medicine anywhere I wish without belonging to the American Medical Association.

• If I were a dentist, I would want to be able to practice dentistry without belonging to any dental association.

• If I were a lawyer, I would want to practice my profession without hindrance from a state law requiring me to belong to the Bar Association.

• If I were an engineer, I would not want my employment to be contingent upon my belonging to an engineers association.

• However, I am just a working man. But, if the state can pass a law which will protect my ‘right’ to ride the coattails of my labor association without paying my share of the association’s expenses, I think the same law should entitle me to live in a community and enjoy all the benefits of city facilities without paying taxes to the city. It seems to me to be the same principle exactly.

As a matter of fact, if I can be a free-rider of a labor union, I should be protected by state law in my ‘right’ to be a free-rider of any collective enterprise, be it city, county, state or national government, club, church or whatever it may be. I don’t know who will get together and provide these facilities for my use, but I imagine it will be the same forward-looking people who are providing them at the present time.”

The New Jersey Labor Herald

Two new staff members

WILLIE STEWART

Shown above is Willie Stewart, newly assigned Business Representative to the Shasta Division.

Brother Stewart has been assigned to Shasta Division to replace Gary Singleton on a temporary basis. Brother Singleton has been off sick for months and has been placed on long term disability.

When Brother Singleton returns, Willie Stewart will remain as a Business Representative, but will be given another assignment.

Willie has been serving Local 1245 for many years (eight to be exact) in various capacities such as Shop Steward, G.C. Joint Grievance Committee member and Chairman of that Committee. He also served as Chairman of the following committees: The Committee to Establish Processing Centers; the G.C. Subcommittee for Negotiations and the G.C. Lines of Progression Committee. In June of 1971, Brother Stewart was elected by the members in General Construction as Executive Board Member-at-Large. Since that time he has served on several working committees established by the Board, including the Communication Committee.

Willie was employed by PG&E as an Electrician in the General Construction Department.

Brother Stewart is looking forward to working with the members in his assignment area and looks for support and cooperation.

KEN NATA

Shown above is Ken Nata, the newest addition to the staff. Ken was an Apprentice Cable Splicer in PG&E’s North Bay Division. He has been an active member of Local 1245 since he joined us nine years ago.

Brother Nata has been a Shop Steward in the North Bay Division for the last four years and served as Unit Chairman of Unit 3711 and also as a member of the Marin Central Labor Council.

Ken Nata will undergo an extensive training program and will be given a specific assignment at a later date.

As a Business Representative, Ken will need any assistance and cooperation membership can give.

Tree Company Employees receive wage increase

Effective January 1, 1973, Local 1245 members employed by four different tree trimming companies will receive an increase in their wages. It will be for the last year of their three year agreements.

Employees of Pacific Tree Expert Company, Davey Tree Surgery Company, and Utility Tree Service, Inc., will receive a 5.5% increase. The increase is based on a formula in their cost of living clause. Southern Tree Service, Inc. employees will receive a 5% increase as provided by their cost of living clause.
Living Cost forecast for ’73
Most Expensive year yet

By Sidney Margolius, Consumer Expert for Utility Reporter

What kind of year can you expect in 1973? From all signs, it will be the most expensive yet. A year ago, this column predicted that living costs would go up about 2% above the November figure for the 2¼ percent the Nixon Administration had tried to set as the maximum rise.

Living costs this past year did, in fact, go up approximately 3% per cent. As this is written, the Dun & Bradstreet wholesale food price index is also at a record high. This means that your food costs, which presently are about 41% per cent higher than a year ago, are going to be even higher in midwinter until heavier supplies especially of pork come on the market in early spring.

Your two big problems are meat and property taxes. Meat prices actually are 11 per cent higher than a year ago. Property taxes are up about 11 per cent this year too, on a national basis—largest increase of any component of housing costs.

The jump in food prices has hit moderate-income families hardest. Pork, a staple of their diet, has required increased numbers of any component of housing costs.

Here are some policies that may help.

1. There is the Social Security Administration’s plan to increase benefits. For workers at all pay levels, according to AFL-CIO Social Security Director Bert Seidman, the added protection is well worth the extra cost. The social security payroll tax went up this month to pay for a substantial increase in benefits, survivorship and disability benefits enacted by Congress last year.

2. The stabilization program has had some success in curbing further rises in already-high medical costs.

3. Some success in curbing further rises in already-high medical costs.

4. The American people—particularly the aged, sick and infirm—are being victimized Americans?

5. Drug gouging practices are being made suckers by big US drug firms. This was the gist of a recent speech by Wisconsin Senator Gaylord Nelson who pointed out these shocking price discrepancies. One drug company sells 100 tablets of a medicine to drugstores in the United States for $7.02, in Ireland for $1.66, and in the United Kingdom for $1.92. Another company sells 100 tablets of a medication to drugstores in the US for $21.84, but in Ireland for $9.31.

6. A third company charges US druggists $3 for a 100-tablet container of a prescription, but 92 cents in Ireland, $1.00 in Great Britain and $1.23 in the United Kingdom for $1.92. Another drugmaker sells 100 tablets of a medicine for $5.95 to pharmaceutical wholesalers in the US but only 79 cents in Ireland, $1.10 in Great Britain and $1.38 in the United Kingdom for $1.92.

7. Nelson charged drug makers with making exorbitant profits on some fast-selling drug medicines at the expense of the American public.

8. As chairman of the monopoly subcommittee of the Senate Select Small Business Committee, Nelson has presided over some five years of hearings into the practices of ethical-drug industry. The upshot is that most of the drug makers have been forced to pay high and discriminatory prices for drugs. But Nelson speculates with examples in which he said American drugmakers charge higher prices for drugs they sell in the United States than abroad.

9. Nelson proposed a procedure for lowering the high cost of important drugs by ending the monopoly they manufacture. He indicated that much of the problem stems from the monopoly drug manufacturers enjoy on some of their products and has proposed a way to cut costs to Americans by eliminating the monopoly.

10. The Social Security Administration’s plan to increase benefits is helpful but not enough. For workers at all pay levels, according to AFL-CIO Social Security Director Bert Seidman, the added protection is well worth the extra cost.

11. The social security payroll tax increase is higher for those who are above the $9,000 level, the tax paid by the worker—matched by the employer—was $486 last year and will rise to $526.50 for 1973.

12. The increase in the payroll tax is higher for those who are above the $9,000 level, for persons making $10,800 a year or more, deductions for social security and Medicare jump from the 1972 level of $668 to $681.80. In 1974, when the cell on subject to social security tax rises to $10,000, persons earning that amount or more will have $742 deducted from their pay and matched by their employer.

13. In return, those earning and paying more will be entitled to higher benefits on retirement or disability and to greater protection for their families if they die. Under the wage-related benefit formula, the higher the pay base on which taxes are paid, the higher the benefit entitlement.

14. Both benefits and the taxable wage base will rise over the years under (Continued on Page Seven)
Shown above from left to right are: Jack McNally, Bus. Rep., Bill Tomlinson, Bob Knepple and Jim Baylor.

Don Casey, Frank Poe and Mark Galich are shown above from left to right at the Sacramento Area Stewards meeting.

Shown above from left to right are: Dick Daugherty, Vic Mitchell and Tony Chaffner.


Shown above is Business Manager L. L. Mitchell, right, and Assistant Business Manager Mert Walters.

"Begie" Bergin, left, and Ken Hagen are shown as they listen to comments regarding shop steward training.

This photo shows Rod Johnson, left and Chief Steward Dick Bedde at the S.M.U.D. Stewards meeting.
How U.S. Jobs ship out on your taxes

(As the old tune goes, “The song is ended, but the melody lingers on.”)

Well, the election is ended, but the problems linger on. One of them is the continuing surge of U.S. jobs, capital and technology shipped overseas by U.S.-based multi-national corporations. The article that follows is excerpted from the November AFL-CIO Federationist. In it, economist Arnold Cantor of the AFL-CIO Department of Research describes how taxes of American workers help subsidize loss of their own jobs.

Jobs and tax justice have few if any competitors for top billing on the list of issues vital to the health and well-being of the nation.

Bridging both is the dual performance of the nation in international trade and the role tax loopholes play in encouraging and subsidizing the export of American jobs, technology and facilities.

The U.S. government now provides American corporations with over $3 billion in tax preferences in their foreign operations. One reason is that American workers lose their jobs, the economy loses part of its industrial base, the federal government loses revenue and the American taxpayer pays the freight.

The nation's fiscal conditions have deteriorated dramatically since the early 1960s and this past year was the most disastrous. In 1971, for the first time since 1893, the nation experienced a trade deficit when Americans bought $45.5 billion worth of merchandise imported from other countries. For the current year, in all likelihood, the performance will be even worse. For the first six months of 1972, according to estimates of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the U.S. trade deficit is about $12 billion—more than double the 1971 gap.

Unfortunately, the nation's income tax laws, which at the very least are supposed to raise revenue for the government, provide substantial inducements for U.S. multinationals to invest and profit overseas. Multinational corporations, loyal to no nation, have mushroomed. Multinational corporations, loyal to no nation, have mushroomed.

Among the results of these developments has been the dramatic shift in the composition of U.S. imports. Since 1960, U.S. imports of autos have mushroomed. Multinational corporations, loyal to no nation, have mushroomed. Multinational corporations, loyal to no nation, have mushroomed. Vast amounts of American capital have gone abroad and American technology is being continually exported through the shifting of American industrial plants to other countries.

The nation's failures on the international economic scene stem from a host of factors. Other nations manage their economies and provide direct and indirect incentives for their industries to compete in the world markets. The U.S. does not.

The nation's income tax laws, which at the very least are supposed to raise revenue for the government, provide substantial inducements for U.S. multinationals to invest and profit overseas. Multinational corporations, loyal to no nation, have mushroomed. Multinational corporations, loyal to no nation, have mushroomed. Vast amounts of American capital have gone abroad and American technology is being continually exported through the shifting of American industrial plants to other countries.

One indication has already been noted—that in 1970 the Treasury received only $900 million in tax revenue from the $17.5 billion in corporate profits made abroad.

As a result of a two decade build up, the value of U.S. investments in foreign subsidiaries is now about $80 billion—seven times greater than it was in 1950. In 1970, $6 billion in interest, dividends and branch profits were paid by foreign offices to U.S. shareholders. A small part of the story—supports the conclusion.

Professor Musgrave notes “it is clear that most income retained abroad is reinvested for plant expansion.” The data available—which tells only a small part of the story—supports the conclusion.

One indication has already been noted—that in 1970 the Treasury received only $900 million in tax revenue from the $17.5 billion in corporate profits made abroad.

As a result of a two decade build up, the value of U.S. investments in foreign subsidiaries is now about $80 billion—seven times greater than it was in 1950. In 1970, $6 billion in interest, dividends and branch profits were paid by foreign offices to U.S. shareholders. A small part of the story—supports the conclusion.

One indication has already been noted—that in 1970 the Treasury received only $900 million in tax revenue from the $17.5 billion in corporate profits made abroad.

As a result of a two decade build up, the value of U.S. investments in foreign subsidiaries is now about $80 billion—seven times greater than it was in 1950. In 1970, $6 billion in interest, dividends and branch profits were paid by foreign offices to U.S. shareholders. A small part of the story—supports the conclusion.

One indication has already been noted—that in 1970 the Treasury received only $900 million in tax revenue from the $17.5 billion in corporate profits made abroad.

As a result of a two decade build up, the value of U.S. investments in foreign subsidiaries is now about $80 billion—seven times greater than it was in 1950. In 1970, $6 billion in interest, dividends and branch profits were paid by foreign offices to U.S. shareholders. A small part of the story—supports the conclusion.
Elk Grove Unit meeting

The photos above and below show more of those in attendance at the Elk Grove January Unit meeting. Congratulations on the excellent participation—keep it up.

The following was received in an envelope postmarked "Stratford-on-Avon, England," accompanied by a note signed Billy Shakespeare, who claimed the manuscript was discovered, yellow with age, in an old suit of armor kicking around the family attic. He said the low voter turnout in 1972 U.S. elections prompted him to send it. The manuscript was signed "Wm. Shakespeare, 1593." We have been unable to verify its authenticity despite assigning Clifford Irving to the task. Nevertheless, we print it here, unabridged, as a matter of probable historical and literary interest.

---

Ye Ode to Ye Non-Voters

Ye government is daft, thou say,
And doth not know whichever way
Is up or down, or go or stay—
But where wert thou election day?

Didst waste ye day on tavern benches
Ogilinge ye serving wenches
And wishing thou couldest spend thine lyfe
With them instead of with thine wyfe?

Things are not quite right, sayst thou?
Thine taxes pinch, thine purse is low
Ye traffick jammes, ye hornes that blow?
On 'lection day, thou didst not show.

All shouldst be better, art thou wishing,
Whilst art blintzing and knishing?
A pax on all such tardie wishing
Election day, thou weniest fishing.

Next time, mightst take a second looke?
Mightst' ear a leaf from others' booke.
And not thine vote leave all forsooke?
Til then, feel what thou wert—a schnooke.***

---

* Topless waitresses.

** "Blintzinge and knishinge" meant the eating of blintzes and knishes, extremely popular foods of the day. Excellent recipes can be found, historians say, in Queen Elizabeth I's "Ye Oldie Cookie Bookie and Other Palace Scandals."

*** 19th Century English slang whose closest modern equivalent is "nibblish."

Editor's note: You might have noticed that we refrained from any bitter post-election tirades. The electorate, which includes union members in general and Local 1245 members specifically, has spoken. The real shame of "Election 72" was the large number of people who failed to exercise their citizenship. "Memo from Cope," a newsletter from the national organization, has captured the feeling of those who took the time to vote.

---

You can free Presidential candidates from fat-cat donors

For the first time, you the taxpayer have it in your hands to help free presidential candidates, starting with the 1976 campaign, from reliance on big contributors.

And it won't cost you one cent.

This emancipation of candidates is written in Form 4875, which accompanied the Federal tax forms either already received by, or in the mail to, all taxpayers.

Using Form 4875, you can direct Internal Revenue to place $1 (or $2 on a joint return) in one of two types of funds for 1976 presidential candidates. It's right there in Form 4875.

1. You can designate the $1 or $2 for a specific political party to be used for its presidential candidate in 1976. (You can not, however, single out the contribution for a specific candidate.)

2. You can direct your contribution to a non-partisan general account for all eligible candidates for President.

Your contribution will not—repeat, will not—cost you a penny. It will not be added to what you might owe in federal taxes, nor will it be deducted from any tax refund owed to you.

This is the first real chance the average American has been provided to take financing of presidential politics away from the millionaires. It's right there in Form 4875.

---

How U.S. Jobs ship out on your taxes

(Continued from Page Five)

federal) has received a total of $5537 in tax revenue. American tax receipts from the U.S. corporation operating overseas were only $480.

Thus, the firm profiting abroad has the advantage of a lower tax rate, the United States has been deprived of badly needed tax revenue and of course the money invested and the jobs generated to produce the profit were not to be found in Pennsylvania.

Fortunately, legislation, which offers specific remedies for the nation's trade and investment problems, has been introduced in Congress by Sen. Vance Hartke (D-Ind.) and Rep. James Burke (D-Mass.). The Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972 would provide the much needed and long overdue reshaping of the tax, trade and other federal laws that have contributed to the international crisis which is costing American jobs and posing a constant and growing threat to the nation's economic health.

If enacted, the bill would be a giant step toward restoring a balance in international trade and investment, promoting a just tax structure and stemming the export of American jobs.

In introducing the bill, Hartke appropriately noted "Old remedies have not worked... The textbook theories of the 1930s and the 1940s no longer apply in today's world of international trade." The legislation is needed, he said, "to protect the best interests of America against the worst practices of international corporations."

Putting an end to the privileged tax status enjoyed by American-based multinational corporations investing and profiting in foreign countries is not an attempt to discriminate, punish or penalize. Closing these loopholes would simply eliminate tax subsidies from the list of incentives that provoke corporate decisions to invest, profit and create jobs overseas. —Memo from Cope
Pension Benefits

(Continued from Page One)

needed at age 65. This would be the amount needed if there were no interest earnings on the $180.00.

However, when the worker retires he will receive only $1.00 the first month, leaving $179.00 in the fund to earn interest. The second month he will receive $1.01, leaving $178.00 in the fund (plus some interest earnings to date) and so on. The $180.00 is, therefore, more than enough. The $180.00 must be "discounted for interest." In addition, some retirees will die, leaving their unpaid annuities to help pay for the pensions on those continuing to live. The funds account needed must take into account both interest and mortality. The amount needed for a pension of $1.00 per month at age 65 is $150.69, assuming interest at 3.4% and mortality according to the 1949 Annuity Mortality Table. So, with some simple arithmetic, you can see that to provide a monthly pension of $500.00 it would take $65,345.00 in a pension fund. This example illustrates the normal costs when a worker reaches age 65. There are other cost factors involved in the pension program itself.

Union brothers should recognize the fact that the pension is not a gift from the employer but is a deferred wage which is earned by current labor services. Pension cost is chargeable as operating expense in the same way that wages are charged. When a pension plan is brought within the scope of a collective bargaining agreement, both parties thereby acknowledge that the plan is in fact a part of the pay which the workers are to receive in exchange for their services.

This means that the worker's interest in the pension fund is not established solely by reason of his advanced age and "long and faithful service." Rather, his interest is cumulative for the entire period of service under the contract.

It should be noted that, in principle, the worker's interest in a negotiated pension plan is the same whether the plan is contributory or non-contributory. The pension based on hours earned by the worker is paid by the Company; whereas the employer pays all of the costs of the pension or not, the entire contribution represents credits the workers have earned.

It is our intent to discuss pension plans in more detail in future issues of the Utility Reporter.

Dictionary of Some Pension Terms

Actuarially Sound—A pension program in which future as well as current costs are recognized and where provision has been made to meet these costs over a reasonable period of time.

Annuity—Periodic payments made to a retired employee until death or, for a specified period of time.

Variable Annuity—Annuity expressed in terms of benefit units instead of fixed dollar amounts.

Current Service—Participation in a plan after its adoption, also referred to as future service.

Life Expectancy—The average number of years an individual at a given age may be expected to live.

Mortality Table—A table based on past experience which indicates the number of people who will on the average die at any given age.

Social Security worth cost

(Continued from Page Three)

new escalator provisions, but no increase in the tax rate is scheduled before 1978.

Over the past five years, the average benefit for a retired worker and his wife, both over 65, has risen from $144 to $273 a month; for a widowed mother with two minor or in-school children, from $224 to $387 a month, and for a disabled worker with a wife under 65 and one or two children, from $213 to $355 a month.

As of the start of this year, also, workers over 65 will be able to earn up to $2,100 a year before their benefits are reduced $1 for every $2 earnings. The previous cutoff was $1,880. Also, those who work after 65 at income high enough to qualify them for benefits will be entitled to higher benefits when they do retire.

Men who retire before age 65 or have reduced earnings in the years between 62 and 65 will be able to take advantage of an optional method of computing benefits that previously had been allowed only for women workers.

Because workers pay only half the cost of social security—the employer matching-tax finances the balance—the program provides protection that the vast majority of families couldn't afford. But for continued, needed improvements in the program, the AFL-CIO and other groups have urged that a portion of social security benefits be financed from general federal revenues—a concept included in the original social security legislation submitted to Congress in 1935 but never adopted by Congress.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council last year urged an immediate general revision of social security benefits that have been earned by the 50-50 employer-worker tax with a three-way division in which the worker, his employers and the government would put an equal amount into the program.

—The Los Angeles Citizen
**Cords Can Kill**

A cord attached to a pacifier fatally strangled a baby girl in Canada this year. The 10-month-old infant was found hanging from a crib string. Although a jury ruled death was accidental, it recommended that pacifier manufacturers not include strings with their products, and place a warning against them in each package. The infant's mother also urged a ban on cribs with protruding posts.

Another pacifier cord claimed the life of another 10-month-old infant—a boy in Texas this time. Police said the child apparently stood up along the side of his playpen, hooking the cord around a post, then sat down, strangling himself.

Pacifier cords, drapery and venetian blind cords, telephone cords, a pull cord from a cradle—many of these cause countless and needless infant deaths. How can you, as a parent, avoid the risk of strangulation for your child?

Don't buy toys with long cords for infants or very young children. And when you buy pacifiers, an old saying takes on new meaning: "No strings attached!"

Strings on toys attached to cribs, playpens and carriages should not be longer than 10 inches. Loops or animal-shaped rings at the ends of retractable pull cords should have a diameter too small to hook onto knobs and horizontal bars.

Keep cords and playpens out of reach. Cords out of reach go away. Parents who have seen their babies wind up in National Safety Council cribs and playpens can testify to this.

**A LETTER FOR WORKING MEN**

If you're one of those workers who woe to his safety equipment, here's a letter that you ought to read. It was dug up by President Kenneth Finley of Local 196 of the United Rubber Workers.

Finley suggests that it might enlighten some workers and their wives if the lady of the household was required to sign this statement before sending her hubby off to work in the morning:

"I hereby authorize my husband to work without safety glasses, safety shoes, hard hat or other safety equipment. I hereby promise that I, without complaint, will perform the following duties for him if he's crippled or blinded:

1. I will lead him about through the house and yard.
2. I will help him eat and dress.
3. I will describe the scenery to him when we go on our vacations.
4. I will faithfully read to him every night instead of his usual TV.
5. I will faithfully describe to him the way the children's eyes light up at Christmas and tell him all about their graduations and weddings.
6. I will teach him to do the housework so I can be free during the day in order to get a job to support him and the children.
7. I will do all the work around the house and yard that he used to do.
8. I will do my best to teach our little boy how to catch a ball, how to build model airplanes, and how to fish and hunt."

—The Trades Unionist

---

**The Safety Scene**

**Skier Heal Thyself**

Each year U.S. skiers suffer 35,000 leg fractures, and efforts have been made to develop a safer binding to reduce such injuries. However, a four-man research team from Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Cleveland, has found that there is no feasible binding now on the market that will prevent all leg fractures.

The researchers measured stresses on the tibia, the bone most commonly broken in ski injuries, varying the rate of speed and type of fall. They reported that although it may be possible to design ski bindings that will release before fractures occur, the emphasis should be on developing new techniques for checking and setting bindings.

---

**Job Safety and Local 1245 Members**

In the last issue of the Utility Reporter we ran a reduced copy of the form we use to record accidents. We urged you to report all accidents to the Business Representative or to the Local Union Office.

Shown below is the reverse side of that form, used for reporting potential hazards or unsafe work practices. The form is self-explanatory, but in the event any questions should arise contact your Business Representative or Shop Steward. Three hundred and twenty-five thousand, eight hundred and ninety-one.

The Local Union's capability of resolving any problems relating to correcting unsafe work practices or procedures or eliminating hazards through investigation of accidents depends on you, the member in the field. You must let us know.

If by chance there is not enough room on these forms for all the information gathered by you, please feel free to attach another sheet of paper with this report for such material. In the event you are out of the forms and something occurs that the Local Union should be informed of, write it out on anything and send it in.