Dedicated Unionist, Wayne Weaver dies

News of the death of former Business Representative Wayne Weaver, 59, reached the Union Hall on Friday, October 30, shortly after he passed away.

Weaver, who left staff last year following a siege of ill health, suffered a heart attack earlier that week, while visiting family and had been hospitalized when major complications were discovered.

A highly respected Unionist, Weaver will be missed by his many, many friends throughout the jurisdiction.

Before leaving staff in 1986, he'd had several bouts with severe high blood pressure, but continued to maintain his staff commitments.

Somehow it just didn't seem possible that Weaver, who'd been on staff for 20 years, would not be at the monthly business meeting to contribute his insights and quick assessments when he left for home in the summer of 1986.

Very involved in Union activities, he was first initiated into IBEW Local 1245 in 1951, and had served as a Unit Recorder in Avenal, a Shop Steward in Pipe Line Operations and was a member of key Negotiating Committees and the Advisory Council.

For more than 10 years after coming on Local Union staff in 1966, he chaired both the PG&E and CP National Negotiating Committees. He also served as vice president and delegate on the Kern, Inyo, and Mono counties Central Labor Council.

As a Business Representative Weaver served members in Southern San Joaquin, and portions of the Mojave desert in Kern County.

An ardent supporter of Union ideals, Weaver was very proud of the gains the Local Union had achieved over the years.

Weaver is survived by his wife, Betty and their three daughters and a son.

Services were held in Avenal on November 4 where Unionists gathered among the many mourners to pay final tribute to Brother Weaver who had contributed most of his life to serve a cause he deeply believed in.

In Memoriam
Wayne Weaver
April 7, 1928
Oct. 30, 1987

INITIATIVE PLANS MOVE AHEAD

Court supports Cal-OSHA; Governor appeals

(Cal AFL-CIO News S.F.) — The Third District Court of Appeal has unanimously decided that California’s workers should have their own state safety and health program to protect them in the workplace after all.

In its decision on October 26, heralded by Cal-OSHA supporters everywhere, the three judge panel said Governor Deukmejian exceeded his constitutional authority by misusing his line item veto power to excise 87 million from only the Cal-OSHA program and not the overall department of Industrial Relations budget appropriation.

That action ultimately left work-
THE WEINGARTEN RULE

The right to a Union representative

By Rollie Katz

One of the important rights Local 1245's private sector members have is the right to have a union representative (Shop Steward or Business Representative) present during any investigatory interview conducted by management. The United States Supreme Court held in National Labor Relations Board v. J. Weingarten, 420 U.S. 251, 95 S.Ct. 959, 43 L.Ed2d 171 (1975) that the National Labor Relations Act ("NLRA") grants workers the right to have a representative with him or her any time the employee reasonably believes that the meeting may lead to discipline. However, the employee must ask for a representative. Because the Weingarten decision involved the NLRA, it does not apply to public employees. However, as a general proposition, government workers have been granted the same right by the laws which govern their labor relations. Also, your Local 1245 contract may grant you additional rights and a faster remedy.

In essence, any time your employer wants to interview you as part of its investigation to determine whether you should be disciplined, you can have a representative (remember, you must ask for one). Your belief that the meeting concerns discipline must be reasonable in order for Weingarten to apply. In other words, the so-called reasonable person would believe that the meeting could lead to discipline if he or she was in your shoes.

If you're saying to yourself that this sounds like lawyer talk—you're probably right. My advice is when in doubt, ask for a representative. The worst thing that can happen is the boss will say no. Of course, it does not hurt to look at what the courts and the NLRB have said. In Weingarten, the Supreme Court approved the NLRB's conclusion that one does not have a right to a representative for "...such run-of-the-mill shop-floor conversations as, for example, the giving of instructions or training or needed corrections of work techniques. In such cases there cannot be any reasonable basis for an employee to fear that any adverse impact may result from the interview, and thus we would then see no reasonable basis for his representative."

Thus, the key is whether the boss is giving you instructions as a result of the meeting with the boss or you may be disciplined. If the boss is simply giving you instructions on how to perform a task you don't have the right to have a representative (and you don't need one). On the other hand, if the boss wants to ask you some questions about something that you may not have done, or that you should not have done, you have a right to have a representative.

A few examples of real cases are illustrative. In Weingarten, a union member who worked at a lunch counter was interviewed by a store detective and her store manager about an allegation that she only paid $1 for $2.98 worth of food (this was in 1972). The manager and the detective did not allow the worker, a Ms. Collins, to have a union representative even though she had asked for one several times. After they concluded their interrogation and spoke with another employee to confirm her statement, the detective told her that she had done nothing wrong. She then "...burst into tears and blurted out that the only thing she had ever gotten from the store without paying for it was her free lunch." Weingarten, supra, 420 U.S. at 255. Apparently, she had received free lunches at other stores in the chain where she had previously worked in accordance with company policy. However, that policy did not apply to the store she was assigned to at the time of the interrogation. The manager and detective immediately commenced a second interrogation regarding the free lunches and again refused Ms. Collins' request for a union representative. (No, the moral of this story is not that there's no such thing as a free lunch.) The detective concluded that she owed the company $160. The manager told Ms. Collins that See NEXT PAGE
she should consider the matter a private one between her and the company and asked her to not discuss it with anyone. She had the good sense to ignore his request as she spoke to her union. It filed an unfair labor practice charge with the NLRB. That charge eventually wound up before the Supreme Court and led to the Weingarten decision. As mentioned above, the Court upheld the NLRB's decision that the employer violated the NLRA by denying her request. The NLRB had also determined that she had not violated Company policy. Yes, this was the old NLRB—the pre-Reagan NLRB. Another example of when an employee is entitled to a representative is International Ladies Garment Workers Union v. Quality Manufacturing Company, 420 U.S. 276, 95 S.Ct. 972, 43 L.Ed.2d 189 (1975), a case decided the same day as Weingarten. The employer's conduct in this case was nothing short of outrageous. (What would you expect in a garment factory?) In this case, the employer not only fired an employee for refusing to meet with its President without a representative, but it also disciplined the worker's two union representatives for trying to represent her! The worker who was the subject of the interview, a Ms. King, had spoken to the boss, along with two co-workers, to complain about the piecework pay system. After the meeting ended on an acrimonious note, Ms. King returned to the shop floor. Later in the day Ms. King turned off the machine she operated and talked with some other employees. When one of the bosses told Ms. King to resume work she told him her own business. The boss then ordered Ms. King to report to the Company President's office. Ms. King asked her union "chair lady", a Ms. Mulford, to represent her. The President ordered Ms. Mulford back to work and ordered Ms. King into his office. Both refused. Ms. Mulford was suspended a few days later. Ms. King was again ordered to the President's office. This time she asked the "assistant chair lady", Ms. Cochran, to join her. To make a long story not quite so long, there was a repeat performance. Eventually, all three were disciplined—King and Mulford were fired. Cochran was suspended.

The Supreme Court upheld the NLRB's decision that the employer violated the NLRA. The NLRB found that Ms. King believed that she may be denied a union representative if she was entitled to a union representative. It also found that she was fired for exercising her right to have a representative and that her two representatives were disciplined for attempting to carry out their duties as union representatives.

It can't be that simple, you are saying. You are right. First, as noted above, you must have a reasonable belief that the interview may lead to discipline. Second, you must ask for a representative. However, if you do, the employer may refuse your request with justifying its refusal to you. Furthermore, the employer does not have to bargain with your representative although the representative certainly may advise you and attempt to do so. So, what's the remedy? Well, the Reagan Board has done it again. At one time the law was that an employee who was disciplined and denied her or his Weingarten rights would be reinstated. However, the Reagan Board has said that the employee only be reinstated if the NLRB concludes that the employee was fired for exercising her or his Weingarten right. If there is some other reason, the employer will only be subject to a cease and desist order that tells the employer not to do it again. The NLRB's general counsel, on behalf of the Union and its members, must prove that the employee was fired for exercising his or her Weingarten rights. In other words, the Reagan NLRB has taken away the hammer the NLRB had previously used to enforce your Weingarten rights. Of course, if an employer were to deny some other employee her or his Weingarten rights, during the life of a cease and desist order, it will be in contempt and subject to a fine.
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By Jack McNally
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**Cal-OSHA initiative; possibly a life or death matter**

The veto of Cal/OSHA by Governor George Deukmejian has dealt a severe blow to working people in this state. The takeover by Federal OSHA reduces the level of protection for all non-public employees. The reduced levels cut across standards involving safety regulations and health hazards.

If the Governor's veto prevails, Local 1245 and other IBEW locals will get a good dose of what the change means with respect to how electrical work is performed.

A year ago, the utilities in the state of California, with PG&E leading, petitioned the Standards Board of Cal/OSHA to allow the barehand method on high voltage and to raise the voltage limits for rubber gloving primary. Under Cal/OSHA, the barehand method and the use of rubber gloves on voltages over 5,000 volts were not permitted. The utilities and the local unions were participating in Cal/OSHA facilitated advisory committee meetings to discuss the proposed changes.

When the Governor announced his intention to defund Cal/OSHA, many of the Cal/OSHA employees began to leave, including the personnel who were coordinating the high-voltage hearings. As a result, the high-voltage activity came to a halt. In July, Cal/OSHA was in fact defunded and Federal OSHA took over responsibility in the private sector.

Under the federal rules, high-voltage barehand method is permissible, and also the rubber-gloving of high voltage primary is permissible to the limit of what the rubber gloves can stand. This means the utilities are, in essence, free from government regulation.

While all of this has been going on during most of this year, law suits were filed to prevent Governor Deukmejian from abolishing the state plan. So far, all have failed except for one case. This case was before the California Appeals Court, which has ruled that the Governor cannot abolish an agency established by the legislature. The Governor has appealed this case to the California Supreme Court, with no time table for a decision.

The abolition of Cal/OSHA is of great concern to labor. As a result, the Executive Council of the California Labor Federation has adopted a resolution to institute a drive to qualify an initiative to place on the November 1988 ballot a proposition to restore Cal/OSHA. Signature gathering will begin in the very near future as there is a time table that has to be followed. Local 1245 will be actively involved in the support of this drive and members will be asked to sign the initiative.

Many of our members have, or will be, exposed to greater risks and less enforcement on matters of safety and health at the workplace if Governor Deukmejian's action is allowed to stand. Our public employee members continue to be covered by Cal/OSHA, as they are exempt from Federal OSHA. However, the service and response have been greatly reduced, as the budgets and manpower have been greatly reduced.

In our industry, many of our members are subject to extreme hazards and risks on the job. Cal/OSHA standards have helped to minimize some of these hazards and risks. This action by this Governor has to be reversed. For some of our members, it may well be a matter of life and death.

In Unity,
Cal-OSHA workshop

Business Manager Jack McNally announced at the time that delegates from the Local Union were set to attend two California State AFL-CIO Federation workshops designed to train participants in organizing the Cal-OSHA ballot initiative campaign. Six hundred thousand signatures must be collected to place the initiative on the November 1988 General election ballot.

The process for gathering signatures is set to begin in December in order to place the measure on the November 1988 ballot. Local Union members were asked at October Unit Meetings to consider authorizing an Executive Board presentation to contribute to the initiative campaign. Total campaign costs are expected to run well over $2 million to restore Cal-OSHA. Labor groups decided to move ahead with the initiative despite an October ruling by the Third District Court of Appeal which affirmed on the 26th that workers in California should have their own health and safety program.

Court supports Cal-OSHA

From PAGE ONE

place protection under Cal-OSHA for only public employees and transfers the state sector protection to federal OSHA, a clearly inferior program. The court charged that the Governor may not, by using the budget procedure, assert his veto power over individual items, repeal an existing program, in this case, Cal-OSHA, upon which the legislature has power and authority.

The suit was brought by California Rural Legal Assistance and California State Employees Association, Local 1000 of the Service Employees. The California Labor federation joined the two groups by filing an amicus, or "friend of the court" brief.

On Tuesday, the Governor announced that he will appeal the ruling to the state supreme Court, a court dominated by his own appointees.

Despite its current make-up, only two weeks, the Governor declared in the Harbor case that the Governor misused his veto power by selectively trimming money from a welfare program. It is widely believed that the decision heavily influenced the Appeals Court ruling and gives hope to Cal-OSHA supporters that a favorable decision will come from the high court on the Governor's appeal.

The opinion, written by Justice Coleman Byrnes and concurred in by Justices Robert T. Puglia and Keith F. Sparks, goes on to describe the process and his veto power over the Governor's powers. The governor has usurped the decision "a victory for constitu-

Conflicting seat belt findings reported

Conflicting reports have been circulating regarding lap belt safety in vehicles.

Recently one of our members on the PLO Southern Area Joint Grievance Committee, citing a National Transportation Safety Board report, brought up the possibility of increased severity of injury, or risk of death in the event of an accident when using lap belts only, which are the lone restraints in some trucks, and rear passenger seats. At the time of the meeting, the group decided as an interim measure to continue lap belt use due to both State law, and PG&E Company policy, while referring the issue to the Joint IBW, and Company Health and Safety Committee for further consideration.

Subsequent findings indicate that the NTBS report was misleading, and that a lap belt was indeed better safety than at all. The NHTSA report by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration cites that the Board's study was based on an extremely small data base which does not give a true picture of safety belt performance. The NTBS study looked only at 26 cases in which rear seat lap belts did not work. It looked only at frontal crashes and failed to consider side collisions and rollover crashes in which belts are particularly effective. Moreover, the Board looked only at injuries caused by the belts and ignored situations such as ejections which are generally fatal and are prevented by seat usage.

NHTSA studies of thousands of crash reports clearly show that a person riding in the rear seat of a motor vehicle has a much better chance of avoiding serious injury or death by wearing a safety belt.

NHTSA has compiled five comprehensive studies, all of which indicate that safety belts— including lap belts—are very effective in reducing the risk of death or serious injury in a vehicle crash. These studies are based on large data bases covering thousands of crash reports, rather than on a few isolated reports. These reports clearly indicate that occupants are better protected by wearing safety belts than by traveling unrestrained, in both the front and rear seats of cars, and regardless of the type of belt system used.

For example, one study conducted using data from North Carolina traffic crash data files reviewed crash reports involving more than 1,000,000 occupants. That study found that rear seat occupants using lap belts were 41 to 49 percent more likely to avoid serious injury or death than those who did not use those belts.

Other safety groups agree with NHTSA's position on the value of belts. The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety responded to the NTBS study with a statement that motorists are better off with a lap belt than no belt at all.

The NHTSA did agree that sometimes safety belts can cause injury to car occupants, but said that given all the statistics on crash data, anyone traveling by car is better off wearing a seat belt than traveling unprotected. The NHTSA indicated that front and rear seat passengers, whether children or adults, using either lap belts or lap and seat belt combinations would be better protected than someone not wearing belts.

The NHTSA report encouraged medical personnel to devote specific attention to crash injuries that may be difficult to diagnose, because safety belts are "so effective in preventing immediate fatalities and obvious injury.

That combination lap and shoulder belts, provide greater protection than lap belts alone was pointed out. NHTSA did stress however, that didn't necessarily mean that combination lap and shoulder belts should be required in the rear seat of all cars. The NHTSA is currently reviewing information and has been petitioned by a child passenger
Business Manager McNally attends AFL-CIO convention; calls for delegate support of Cal-OSHA resolution

Business Manager Jack McNally was one of the California delegates at the recent national AFL-CIO convention who spoke supporting a resolution to call for restoration of the Cal-OSHA program. McNally outlined the actions in the state which have been undertaken to restore the program following Governor Deukmejian’s blue pencil of the entire Cal-OSHA program. The resolution was approved supporting “the initiative campaign of the California Labor Federation and reestablish Cal-OSHA, and to call on affiliates to give every measure of assistance to the California Federation in its battle to win voter approval on its initiative.” McNally told the convention participants, “Electric workers have participated for many years in the development of safety and health standards that were established long before Cal-OSHA. Deukmejian’s veto wiped out major protective standards for work on high voltage lines.”

In other action at the convention, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters was reaffiliated with the AFL-CIO after a 30 years’ absence. Official reaffiliation date was November 1. Teamster president Jackie Presser was elected to the AFL-CIO executive council.

Conflicting seat belt findings reported

From PAGE FOUR

protection group to begin rule making on this issue. NHTSA is considering the NTSB report in this matter and additional data to determine whether to grant the protection group’s petition and begin rule making. As an agency of the U.S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA is responsible for administering the federal government’s auto safety programs, including safety standards, vehicle recalls, working with the states to improve traffic law enforcement, and encouraging safe driving practices. The NTSB is an independent Federal agency which conducts accident investigations and makes recommendations to the Department of Transportation.

“We want to continue to encourage all our members to use seat belts. Buckling up at home, and at work can help save lives and prevent countless injuries,” Assistant Business Manager Ron Fitzsimmons said.

Rear Seat Lap Belts

Based on numerous studies conducted by NHTSA, as well as other researchers, the agency believes that compared to no restraint, lap belts are effective in reducing the risk of serious injury and fatality. Some of the studies which allowed us to reach this conclusion are:

- A study performed on data from the Fatal Accident Reporting System from 1975 to 1984. This study estimated a fatality reducing effectiveness of 14-24% for rear seat lap belts.

- A study of crashes in Alberta, Canada from 1978 to 1980. This study estimated an effectiveness in reducing incapacitating injury of 23% to 59%, depending on crash severity and occupant age.

- A study of crashes in Maryland crashes from 1981-1984. This study estimated an effectiveness in reducing major or fatal injury of 41% for occupants age 15 and above.

- An agency analyses of the National Crash Severity Study and National Accident Sampling System data for the time period 1977-1984. This analysis estimated an effectiveness in reducing fatality of 39% and an effectiveness in reducing fatality and overnight hospitalization of 57%.

- A study performed on data from the Fatal Accident Reporting System from 1975-1984. This study estimated a fatality reducing effectiveness of 14-24% for rear seat lap belts.
Strikemakers & Strikebreakers

By Sidney Lens

The history of American labor has been a turbulent one. Tens of thousands of people have been arrested, injured, or even killed in strikes that have pitted employees against management and often government, and inflamed the public. What caused workers to leave their jobs and join the picket line, risking their livelihood and sometimes their lives? How are strikes carried out? How are strikes broken?

Sidney Lens, well-known writer and longtime union official, explores this history of strikes, from the formation of the first labor unions to the present day in his book STRIKEMAKERS & STRIKEBREAKERS (E.P. Dutton, New York, 1985).

Bread and Roses

It is we who plowed the prairies; built the cities where they trade; Dug the mines and built the workshops; endless miles of railroad laid; Now we stand, outcast and starving, 'mid the wonders we have made; But the Union makes us strong.

from "Solidarity Forever," the union song written by Ralph Chaplin

The first decade and a half of this century was called the Progressive Era. After a long period of class conflict, there was an awakening of conscience in America. Writers like Ida Tarbell, Lincoln Steffens, and Upton Sinclair — known as muckrakers — exposed corruption in industry and government.

Twenty-five states enacted legislation limiting the workday, and tens of thousands of working people won a reduction of hours through their unions. Hours of labor for killed workers fell by one and a half. In a week, and for the unskilled to 56. Thirty-eight states passed laws setting age limits and hours of work for children. Thirty-five introduced workmen's compensation bills to provide payments for employees injured in industrial accidents. Such rights did not exist before.

Still, a seamy side existed in the Progressive Era alongside its sunnier one. There was a bedlam of strikes, antimigrant campaigns, picket line murders, abuse of immigrants, and other downright cruelty. Nothing, for instance, could have matched the harshness displayed against hard-rock miners and smeltery workers in the Colorado Rockies. During their fifteen-month strike at Cripple Creek, Colorado, in 1903-04, 42 men were killed, 112 wounded, 1,345 held in bull pens for many months without the right of appeal. They were told that they had been cheated out of "four loaves of bread," and roamed from room to room shutting off electricity, cutting belts, smashing light bulbs, and threatening those who would not leave their machines. "Better to starve fighting," they shouted, "than to starve working."

By 11:30 A.M. the mill was shut. From the Washington mill, the strikers, with Italian and American flags flying, marched to another and then still another mill, repeating the process and inflicting damage. A few workers were hurt, six strikers were arrested, various machinery was smashed, and windows were broken. But despite the violence, there were ten thousand men, women, and children on strike.

Unions were weak in Lawrence. The AFL's United Textile Workers of America had a small local union of skilled mulespinners. There were also nine independent unions, representing better-paid English-speaking craftsmen. The Industrial Workers of the World Local 20 claimed a thousand members, of whom only three hundred had paid their dues. In an industry with thirty-two thousand workers, the total number of union members before the strike was amazingly small. And none of the unions, including the IWW, had played a role in initiating the strike. It was spontaneous.

Once the work stoppage began, the strikers realized they needed help — to form picket lines, deal with the press, raise money for relief, call out workers from other factories, conduct mass meetings. Sam Gompers of the AFL was not particularly sympathetic to the strike. The local AFL affiliate not only did not exist before.

As part of its ongoing effort to keep our membership and the public aware of the serious issues now confronting the labor movement, the Local Union purchased six copies of Len's book for donation to Northern California public libraries. We will reprint selections from Len's book in the Utility Reporter over the next several months.

From the book Strikemakers and Strikebreakers by Sidney Lens. Copyright (c) 1985 by Sidney Lens. Published by arrangement with Lodestar Books, a division of E.P. Dutton. Available from your local bookstore or for $13.95 plus $1.50 shipping and handling from Lodestar Books, 2 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10016.

Wages, even by 1912 levels, were exceptionally poor. For 56 hours of work a week, the average pay was $8.76. Half of that went for rent. A five-room flat in the most congested part of town, with the toilet in the hallway, rented for 84 a week. According to a U.S. Senate report, a normal family of five had to have two members working in order to exist. Most families had to take in boarders to add a pittance to their income.

"Often," one witness told a congressional committee, "the children went hungry. There were days when only bread and water kept them alive." Walter Weyl, an adviser to former President Theodore Roosevelt, reported that he had "rarely seen in any American city so many shivering men without overcoats, as I have seen in the cloth-producing town of Lawrence." Of every 1,000 infants, 172 died before the age of one. Company profits were quite good. Dividends of the largest company, American Woolen, were twice as high in 1911 as in 1902.

The strike began after a new law reduced the work schedule for women and children from 56 hours a week to 54, and the companies refused to pay the workers for those 2 hours. Thus, what was supposed to be an improvement in the textile worker's conditions turned out to be, in effect, 2 hours' cut in pay. Two years earlier, when weekly hours had been reduced from 58 to 56, the operatives had been paid the same amount for the shorter workweek. This time, however, shorter hours meant less pay.

On January 11, as the pay envelopes were being passed around at the Everett Cotton Mill, Polish weavers counted their money and began shouting. "Not enough pay, not enough pay." Company men who spoke Polish tried to explain that since they had worked only 54 hours, they were entitled to only 54 hours' pay. But the women were not appeased — their paychecks were 32 cents short. There was the same outburst and refusal to work. Every nightfall the 1,750 operatives had determined they wouldn't go back unless they got the 32 cents. The same decision was arrived at by 100 workers at a second mill. The next morning, the fury spread from one to another. Italian workers at American Woolen's Washington mill shouted that they had been cheated out of four "loaves of bread," and roamed from room to room shutting off electricity, cutting belts, smashing light bulbs, and threatening those who would not leave their machines. Better to starve fighting, they shouted, than to starve working.

Unions were weak in Lawrence. The AFL's United Textile Workers of America had a small local union of skilled mulespinners. There were also nine independent unions, representing better-paid English-speaking craftsmen. The Industrial Workers of the World Local 20 claimed a thousand members, of whom only three hundred had paid their dues. In an industry with thirty-two thousand workers, the total number of union members before the strike was amazingly small. And none of the unions, including the IWW, had played a role in initiating the strike. It was spontaneous.

Once the work stoppage began, the strikers realized they needed help — to form picket lines, deal with the press, raise money for relief, call out workers from other factories, conduct mass meetings. Sam Gompers of the AFL was not particularly sympathetic to the strike. The local AFL affiliate not only did not exist before.

Women in particular worked in gloomy, stench-ridden sweatshops, with inadequate ventilation, heat, or other conveniences. At one of these sweatshops, the Triangle Shirtsiaft Company on New York City's East Side, 147 Jewish and Italian immigrant women met their death.
Ettor’s first order of business was to form a strike committee. Four workers were elected by each of the fourteen largest ethnic groups, forming the committee of forty-six that ran the strike. “Never before,” noted the New York Sun, “has a strike of such magnitude succeeded in uniting in one unflinching, unyielding, determined, and united army as large and diverse a number of human beings.”

The main job of the committee was the organization of large-scale picketing. Thousands of strikers and friends walked in front of the mills twenty-four hours a day, carrying placards with messages such as DON’T BE A SCAB and calling on friends to join them. One of the picket signs expressed the view of women workers: WE WANT BREAD AND ROSES TOO.

On January 20, the companies tried to reopen their mills. The strikers formed a massive picket line. Although there was some violence, Joe Ettor, at the head of the line, constantly urged his followers to avoid confrontations. When the police stopped the marchers on the main street, Ettor led them into side streets. Nonetheless an ugly mood built up, with strikers throwing stones at streetcars carrying scabs. The New York Times reported: Real Labor War Now in Lawrence.

In the evening, police set up barricades. Strikers threw chunks of coal and snowballs at the police. After a police sergeant was hit, he ordered the police to draw their guns. One policeman, identified by nineteen strikers as Oscar Benoit, fired and killed an Italian striker named Anna Lo Pizzo. The governement claimed that Lo Pizzo was killed by two union sympathizers, and so convicted Wobbly Arturo Giovannitti as accessories—even though neither of them had been anywhere near the picket line that evening. The two strikers were held in jail for the next eight months.

The mill owners and the authorities evidently believed that the strike would collapse once its leaders were jailed. But this was not the case. When the courts refused to grant bail for Ettor and Giovannitti, IWW leader Bill Haywood came to Lawrence to take charge of the strike, assisted by a team of other national officers.

Meanwhile, martial law was imposed by the city government. Twelve more militia companies were called in, street gatherings of three or more were forbidden, and Colonel E. LeRoy Sweetser became, for all practical purposes, the ruler of Lawrence. The town’s mill district soon resembled a city awaiting war. Arrests, teargassing, and harassment skyrocketed. Even nonstrikers were driven from the street. An eighteen-year-old Syrian boy, member of the strikers’ drum and bugle corps, was bayoneted to death by militia as he tried to run away from them.

During this time a sensational development occurred which won considerable public support for the strikers. On February 5, the Italian Socialist Federation in New York offered to place children of Lawrence’s strikers in foster homes, so they could be better fed and housed during the stoppage. On February 10, 119 children, ages 4 to fourteen, accompanied by 4 women, made their way from Lawrence to Grand Central Station in New York City. A week later, 126 more emaciated children were shipped out, most of them to New York City. 35 to Barre, Vermont. The exodus raised tempers, and hostility toward the woolen corporations.

On February 22, Lawrence’s police chief announced that no more children would be allowed to leave. Seven tons who were headed to Connecticut that day were placed in a paddy wagon and taken to a police station, and their parents were told the city would provide for them.

The climax came two days later when two hundred children were scheduled to depart for Philadelphia. Most parents with their children in fear that they would be held just as they had done before. But forty strikers and their parents did show up. Police and militia barred the way, and when the children, lined up two by two in the train, the police began swinging their clubs left and right. Mothers and children were dragged to a military truck and clubbed still again. Thirty adults and youngsters were arrested on the charge of "congregation": fourteen children were sent to the city farm by the juvenile courts.

News of the event sent shock waves throughout the nation. "It’s an outrage," said America’s leading literary figure, William Dean Howells. Progressive U.S. senators joined the chorus demanding an investigation of events in Lawrence, and such well known figures as Mrs. William Howard Taft, wife of the president, journeyed to the strike scene to observe matters for themselves. Scores of reporters and writers came to the textile city to make their own estimate. One of the high points of the hearing was the testimony of Camella Teoli, age fourteen, who told how she was recruited for a job at the American Woolen Mill even though she had been under the legal age—fourteen. On her second week at the job, her hair got caught in a machine and "pulled the scalp off."

She had been in the hospital seven months, she said, and was still under treatment. Why did she strike? she was asked. "Because I didn’t get enough to eat at home," Camella replied.

The negative publicity from the hearings in Washington, as well as the fact that order were piling up, finally forced the corporations to give in. After nine and a half weeks of the strike, William Wood of American Woolen finally agreed to wage increases of 5 to 21 percent. The 21 percent went to the lowest paid workers, who received 9% cents an hour. Other improvements included time and a quarter for overtime, a pledge to reinstate all strikers, and of course the 54-hour week.

On March 14, when fifteen thousand workers met to ratify the agreement, Big Bill Haywood told them "you have demonstrated that there is a common interest in the working class that can bring all its members together." The meeting ended with the singing of the Internationale.

There was one piece of unfinished business for the strikers—Ettor and Giovannitti were still in jail. As the ratification meeting adjourned, the strikers agreed to focus all their efforts on freeing them. An Ettor-Giovannitti Defense Committee was formed. On May 1, five thousand Lawrence textile workers marched past the prison where the two IWW members were being held. They carried a banner: IF ETTOR AND GIOVANNITTI ARE TO DIE.

Protest meetings were held not only in America, but in Germany, Sweden, Italy, and France, where some proposed a boycott of American woolen goods and a strike against ships headed for the United States. Giovannitti was nominated in three districts of Italy for the Italian Chamber of Deputies.

On September 30, as the trial of the two men was to begin, twelve thousand textile workers walked out of the mills in a twenty-four-hour protest strike. The police again clubbed strikers and arrested some, and the companies fired fifteen hundred. Haywood had to threaten another general strike to get them reinstated.

The trial lasted fifty-eight days. Both men were acquitted.
Outside Line Apprentices gather for ‘All Hands’ Day

By Linda M. Honn, JATC Office Manager, Huntington Beach

The third annual All Hands’ Day for the California-Nevada Training Trust. The Trust was established in 1971 and since 1972 has operated under the direction of Bill Brockmann. The teaching staff currently is comprised of six capable and dedicated instructors. Frank Lazard is in charge of the Northern school located in West Sacramento. The Southern school is based in Garden Grove where Russ Cridland is resident instructor assisted by Don Ankney, Mike Springer, Tim Sozio, and Don Holter who recently joined the staff.

Brockmann first established All Hands’ Day as a means of bringing all 103 indentured apprentices from both states together with the staff and committee representatives. The day provides an excellent opportunity for and exchange of ideas and direction for the new class-year since many of the men work in remote areas and rarely see each other except for this annual gathering. As old acquaintances are renewed, new ones are made. New apprentices especially are welcomed aboard.

Class sessions were held during the morning and afternoon at Rancho Santiago College in Garden Grove, where apprentices gained clear directions on expectations of the program during their apprenticeship period. IBEW Local 1245 Assistant Business Manager Ron Fitzsimmons and Business Representative Curt Peterson were among the JATC committee members who addressed the group.

The day finished with class pictures, and as goodbyes were said, all concluded it had been a meaningful day.

Classroom studies were part of the day’s activities.

Reports from the Northern office indicate the work has picked up with 193 members assigned to crews. The figure doubled over the previous month.

In Southern California work is pretty stable with approximately 800 members assigned to crews.

Large group of apprentices attended the day-long program.

Business Representative Curt Peterson addresses the participants.

Assistant Business Manager Ron Fitzsimmons prepares to speak to group.

Pole climbing demonstrations.

Director Bill Brockmann welcomes apprentices.

Pole climbing demonstrations.

The work picture... in Northern and Southern California for Outside Line
Scholarship contest announced

The purpose of this contest is to provide a grant in aid for scholarships to colleges and junior colleges, thereby making financial assistance toward the attainment of a higher education.

2. In order to be a candidate in this contest, you must be a son or daughter, natural, legally adopted, or a legal ward of a member of Local Union 1245. You must also be a high school student who has graduated or is graduating in 1988. A copy of your diploma or a letter from your high school stating that you will graduate in 1988 must be attached to your scholarship application.

3. The scholarship grant will be made only to that candidate who intends to enroll full time in any college certified by their State Department of Education and accredited by the local accrediting association.

4. Applications may be secured by addressing the Recording Secretary of Local Union 1245, or by calling the Union office, or by using the form printed below.

5. Checks will be paid directly to the college upon presentation of tuition bills to the Local Union.

6. All applications shall be accompanied by a written essay, not to exceed five hundred (500) words, on the subject designated by the Executive Board.

7. Essays should be submitted on 8½ by 11 paper, on one side, preferably typed and double spaced, with applicant's written signature at the conclusion of the essay.

8. Applications and essays must be mailed to IBEW Local Union 1245, P.O. Box 4790, Walnut Creek, CA 94596, by registered or certified mail only, and be postmarked no later than the first Monday of April of each year.

9. Each year the scholarship shall be presented at the Advisory Council meeting in May; the judge and a guest and the recipient and parents shall be invited, at Local Union expense, to present and receive the scholarship award.

10. A suitable trophy or plaque shall be purchased by the Local Union, at a cost not to exceed $575, to be presented to the scholarship recipient.

NOTE: THE TOPIC FOR THE 1988 AL SANDOVAL MEMORIAL COMPETITIVE SCHOLARSHIP ESSAY IS "HOW TO IMPROVE LABOR'S IMAGE IN THE EDUCATION SYSTEM AND PROMOTE A POSITIVE OUTLOOK CONCERNING LABOR."

The following two questions are to be answered in the essay:
1. What have you seen and learned about labor during your school years?
2. What do you think should have been taught?

APPLICATION FOR THE AL SANDOVAL MEMORIAL COMPETITIVE SCHOLARSHIP
Sponsored by Local Union 1245
INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO
P.O. Box 4790
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

I hereby make application to enter the Competitive Scholarship Contest sponsored by Local Union 1245, IBEW, AFL-CIO:

NAME (Last) (First) (Middle)
ADDRESS (Street) (City) (State) (Zip) (Phone)
NAME OF PARENT
COMPANY
WOFK LOCATION
HIGH SCHOOL WHICH IS LOCATED AT
I EXPECT TO ATTEND COLLEGE OR SCHOOL
LOCATION

This is to certify that the above named candidate is currently enrolled as a student at and has or will be graduating in 1988.

This is to certify that I am a member in good standing of Local Union 1245, IBEW, and the candidate, whose name is signed to this application is my natural, legally adopted, or a legal ward of a member of Local Union 1245.

Name of Member/Parent
Union Card No.

Signature of Member/Parent

STATEMENT OF MEMBER/PARENT

NAME OF MEMBER/PARENT
EMPLOYER LOCATION

I certify that I am a member in good standing of IBEW Local Union 1245, that the Candidate named above, is my natural, legally adopted, or a legal ward of a member of Local Union 1245, and that the Candidate will graduate from high school during the term ending .

Signature of Member/Parent
Union Card No.

This is to certify that the above named Candidate is currently enrolled as a student at and has or will be graduating in .

Official's Signature and Position
The Pacific Gas Transmission Company Clerical Bargaining Committee met for the first time on Thursday, October 22, at the headquarters of Local 1245 in Walnut Creek. Committee members Pam McKean, George Stavros, Debbie Tracey, Charlie Valentino, San Francisco, and Sue DeFoe and Jolene Fifield from Spokane went on a brief tour of the building conducted by Staff Attorney Tom Dalzell and also met Local 1245 staff including Business Manager Jack McNally.

Immediately after the tour, the committee began work on a proposed contract for PGT clerical workers. Working closely with Dalzell, they reviewed current and past employment of clerical workers at PGT. A major accomplishment was the development of common goals with Spokane workers whose particular needs were ably voiced by DeFoe and Fifield. Much of Thursday was spent analyzing wages, job classifications, working conditions and benefits at PGT and determining how a fair and equitable unity can be achieved.

On Friday, the committee began the difficult work of organizing the ideas and goals discussed on Thursday into the framework of a contract. Past and present PGT and PG&E contracts for both clerical and physical workers were closely examined for ways to achieve unity with other workers and adapt new ideas and goals. The Committee briefly interrupted its work to hear a report from Business Representative Art Murray, newly assigned to the PGT physical unit, on recent bargaining activities with PGT and PG&E as well as details of the proposed contracts.

During the afternoon, the committee broke up into two working groups to discuss and analyze some of the more complicated issues of the contract. Afterwards, the entire Committee met again to discuss and approve changes recommended by the working groups. At the conclusion of Friday's meeting, major progress had been made. Committee members expressed satisfaction that the contract taking shape would directly address the goals and needs of the bargaining unit membership and merit their approval.

On Monday, October 26, the last day of the Committee's contract formulation meetings, resolution of details and a few major issues were discussed.

Meeting with the Company will be sometime in January.

Members ratify TCI contract

IBEW members at Tele-Communications Inc. of Nevada voted to accept a one year offer, following an initial rejection of the contract. After four bargaining sessions, the Company submitted what they characterized as their last, best and final offer to the Local Union on October 12. By a vote of 29 to 0, the offer was rejected. On October 21, the parties returned to the bargaining table with counseling from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

The Company would not withdraw their take aways. A ratification meeting was held on October 26 in Reno to vote on the Company's one year offer where the members voted to accept the offer at this time.

The major issues involved in the Company's offer were the elimination of all reference to double time and the reduction of paid holidays from 12 to nine.

The Company's offer did provide for a wage increase of 4 percent to the three technical classifications, and 5.5 percent to all clerical classifications.

This year's bargaining was complicated by the Company's intention to exchange the Reno TCI system to the Times-Mirror Company for the Times-Mirror Phoenix Arizona System as soon as their respective franchises are obtained.

Participating on the negotiating team, along with Assistant Business Manager Orv Owen were Mike Cason, Bill Wilkinson, Nancy Miraglia, and Craig Miraglia.

PGT Physical to vote

A tentative agreement has been reached at PGT Physical and will be going out for a vote sometime in December or January. Participating on the Negotiating Committee were Paul Hathaway, Business Representative Art Murray, Mark Latia, Archie Taylor, Senior Assistant Business Manager Darrel Mitchell, and Frank Locatil. Not pictured is Les Banta.
IBEW Local 1245 presented an information-packed one-day training conference for Public Sector Shop Stewards at Woodlake Inn in Sacramento in mid October.

Assistant Business Manager Ron Fitzsimmons reviewed Cal-OSHA status, and Business Representative Pete Dutton highlighted Federal Sector action of importance to our members.

During the afternoon both the scientific and legal basis of drug testing was discussed by the staff attorney Tom Dalzell and Gary Henderson, Ph.D. of U.C. Davis.

Coordinated by Senior Assistant Business Manager Darrel Mitchell, the program got underway with Business Manager Jack McNally welcoming the members. McNally later brought members up to date on legislative actions that impact the Union.


City of Oakland Bargaining Committee from left to right are Jim Mahoney, Ron Davis, Ed Myall, Bob Gaze, and John Hendry. Business Representative Frank Saxsenmeier reports that City of Oakland members ratified a one year agreement during the first week of October. The agreement is for one year effective July 1, 1987 through June 30, 1988. Highlights of the agreement provides for a 4% general wage increase retroactive to July 1 with additional floating holidays and vacation. State Disability insurance has been integrated with sick leave provided by the City without cost to the employees. Improvement in the Vision Care program, and other minor language changes were also made.

**Unit Meeting Change**

New meeting place:
Unit 1111, Fresno
Cedar Lanes, Cedarland Shields, Fresno
Positive Discipline detailed at Shop Steward Conferences

The Local Union has been reviewing all elements of the newly instituted PG&E Positive Discipline procedures at Shop Steward Conferences. To date, Shop Stewards in Humboldt, Sacramento, Stockton, East Bay, San Francisco, and General Office have reviewed Positive Discipline at scheduled conferences. It is projected that by the end of January, Positive Discipline will have been discussed at all Shop Steward Conferences in the jurisdiction.

Heartfelt thanks

Oct. 4, 1987

Jack McNally
IBEW 1245 Business Manager
P.O. Box 4790
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Dear Mr. McNally,

I would like to thank PG&E and IBEW Local 1245 for their cooperation and effort in helping me recover and return to work. On August 27, 1986 I was hit by a drunk driver while riding my motorcycle and my right leg was amputated four inches above the knee. Because of the accident, I was unable to return to my job as a Gas Serviceman in Sacramento. Through the efforts of Wayne Green, IBEW Business Representative, and Earl Rhodes, Sacramento Gas Superintendent and others, an agreement was worked out so that I was able to return to work as a Service Operator in Woodland. There are many others who helped in this process who are too numerous to mention, but I thank all of those people for their support and help.

I would also like to give a special thanks to the Gas Service Department in Sacramento. The assistance given my family, the donations, the visits while I was in the hospital, and the help I received during the seven months I was off was tremendous. They collected a large cash donation, installed a wood stove and delivered over three cords of wood. We were never without any help when we needed it. I consider myself to be extremely fortunate to have friends such as these to help in times of crisis.

Even though I am not able to mention everyone who helped us during this difficult period, we haven't forgotten who you are and we are thankful for your caring and assistance. Thank You.

Mike and Carol Davis

SUPPORT YOUR LOCAL UNION
BUY YOUR
IBEW LOCAL UNION 1245 LOGO SHIRTS

Order Form:

Name: ____________________________
Address: _________________________ Zip: _____________
Phone Number: ___________________

Crew Sweatshirt $13.00  Hooded Sweatshirt $17.00  T-Shirt $7.00—White Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S M L XL</td>
<td>Lt. Blue—B</td>
<td>$14.00 2XL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S M L XL</td>
<td>Lt. Gray—G</td>
<td>$18.00 2XL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S M L XL</td>
<td>Lt. Blue—B</td>
<td>$28.00 2XL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate size and color choice.

Colors:
Lt. Blue—B
Lt. Gray—G

Make Checks Payable to: Ed Caruso
Send Orders To: SHIRTS—Business Representative Ed Caruso
P.O. Box 4790
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

UNIT 2412 FUNDRAISER