

WIRE or WRITE to  
Your Congressmen in  
Protest Against All  
ANTI-LABOR Bills!

# CHARLOTTE LABOR JOURNAL



VOL XVII; NO. 4

CHARLOTTE, N. C., THURSDAY, MAY 29, 1947

Subscription \$2.00 Per Year

## PUNITIVE LABOR MEASURES ARE ASSAILED

### GREEN WARNS ANTI-LABOR BILLS BLOW AT ALL AMERICAN WORKERS

Washington, D. C. — Warning that the anti-labor legislation now being considered in Congress is a blow, not only at unions, but at everyone who works for a living, was sounded by AFL President William Green in a nationwide radio address over an NBC hookup.

Declaring that the pending legislation presents "the greatest domestic issue facing our Nation today—the question of whether free trade unionism shall survive and function effectively," Mr. Green told the country:

"The first result of such legislation would be wage cuts all down the line, for non-union workers as well as union members, because in modern industry the union wage level sets the standard for all other wages."

Analyzing bills sponsored by Rep. Hartley (R) of New Jersey, and Senator Taft (R) of Ohio, chairmen of the two Congressional Labor Committees, Mr. Green said:

"Suppose the Taft-Hartley slave-labor legislation becomes law, and wages are forced down. Do you believe that the great mass of American workers, afflicted as they are today by continuously rising prices, would be able to sustain the blow? Do you think our American economy as a whole would be able to stand the shock of a drastic cut in mass purchasing power?"

"People would just have to stop buying many of the things they need, business would shrivel, production would drop, millions of workers would lose their jobs and our country would find itself bogged down in another dangerous depression."

"This is not an exaggerated picture I have presented. It is the natural and inevitable consequence of the present drive in Congress to tear down the unions and grind down the workers through punitive legislation."

"Of course the sponsors of this legislation deny any such purpose. They claim they have a mandate from the people to adopt legislation to curb the effectiveness of unions."

"Let us examine this claimed 'mandate.' Undoubtedly, the voters in the last election were disturbed by high prices, by post-war shortages, by the failure of Government controls and by recurring labor-management strife. The people were sick of war on the industrial front. They wanted peace and production."

"But if the Taft-Hartley program passes, the people will not get what they want. Instead, they will get complete chaos in the Nation's industrial life. By destroying the most effective methods of peaceful collective bargaining, by attacking union security and by giving hostile employers unfair advantages over labor, these bills would promote the worst outbreak of industrial strife ever seen in this country."

Mr. Green told the radio audience that "for every employer the sponsors of this legislation claimed was 'pressing' for such labor curbs, he could produce 100 employers who would oppose them."

"The real purpose behind this proposed legislation," Mr. Green said, "is to weaken and destroy labor unions. That purpose is reflected in every line, sentence and section of the Taft and Hartley bills. No pious denials can change this fact."

"In my sincere opinion, no new legislation is necessary. Labor relations, as many a wise employer has discovered, are really a problem in human relations. The problem cannot be solved merely by passing a law. Good will and sincere compliance with existing laws calling for fair col-

(Continued on Page 4)

### All-Out Fight Declared On Enemy Legislators By Georgia Labor Chief

An all-out fight was declared at the annual convention of the Georgia Federation of Labor, held in Savannah, Ga., May 20-23 by George L. Googe, Southern Director, American Federation of Labor, when he stated to the convention that he was asking the members of unions "to refuse to work for employers who declined to continue present contracts."

He further stated that legal tests would come in the first case where the state of Georgia was sustained against any union in the state.

In the address delivered by Mr. Googe he dwelt at some length on the Hartley-Taft bill pending before the National Congress and stated that the passage of such legislation would virtually destroy free trade unionism in America, and that unions would become social clubs instead of aggressive organizations representing the sentiment of the workers. In the special appeal to the delegate assembly, Mr. Googe called upon members of organized labor to contact their Congressmen and reveal to them the feelings of the trade unionists in Georgia.

Georgia's two senators came in for a drubbing. It was pointed out that Senator Russell was supported by Labor when he made his first campaign for the Senate "because of the Talmadge labor record and he has had no serious opposition since that time. "But if he cannot support the position of Labor in regard to the present legislation he should at least support the President and the party and not line up with Senator Taft and the tory ring of the Republican party." He pointed out that the Georgia Federation of Labor and the American Federation of Labor broke violently with President Roosevelt and his advisors in the "purge campaign" of 1938 which was launched against Senator George of Georgia.

Mr. Googe further stated that "every student of Georgia and National history knows that had it not been for the support of Labor that President Roosevelt would have 'purged' Senator George from the Senate. Labor feels that the Senior Senator from Georgia is perfectly able to see through the hysterical smoke screen against organized labor. He, too, should support the President and the Democratic party."

The Southern Director for the American Federation of Labor

pointed out that the hysteria of industry and the anti-labor groups in Georgia was founded on unsound ground and that one of the major industries in Georgia, textiles, is 97 per cent unorganized and that since such a high percent of workers in that industry are unorganized, that there is certainly no fear of union domination and that their argument as to threats of union control of their business is without foundation. He pointed out further that the wood working industry, including the saw mills and kindred types of plants were "99.44 per cent" unorganized and that the same rule applied to that industry in regard to claims that unions would dominate their business.

Mr. Googe reported that the Georgia delegation that has approximately 375,000 new members in the South had been brought into the AFL in the South during the past year because of an extremely active and effective organizing campaign in the Southern states.

Mr. Charles B. Gramling, President of the Georgia Federation of Labor, made an appeal to the delegation to prepare themselves to vote en masse at the polls at the coming election in order to make the anti labor delegation in the Georgia General Assembly "stay at home." Mr. Gramling stated, "We resent the fact that the government tries to regulate collective bargaining agreements reached around the conference table between employers and employes. We resent that. We protest against it, and this conference will register our protest of government control in our economic life."

More than 400 delegates assembled in the ball room of the Hotel Savannah in attendance of the 1947 convention of the Georgia Federation of Labor, representing every city and hamlet in the state of Georgia.

Officers for the next twelve month period were re-elected Friday of this week. Charles B. Gramling was re-elected President and Henry W. Chandler, Secretary-Treasurer. The following were elected for the office of Vice-President: Frank H. Heape, Savannah; J. A. Harper, incumbent, Atlanta; W. W. Holly, incumbent, Augusta; L. W. Bennett, incumbent, Brunswick; J. A. McDonald, incumbent, Rome; J. W. Pate, Macon; W. H. Reed, incumbent, Waycross, and Howard Anthony, Columbus.

### Matthew Woll Cited For Aid to Workers

Philadelphia — Matthew Woll, president of the Labor League for Human Rights and vice-president of the American Federation of Labor, will receive the 1947 Clendenin Award of the Workers Defense League at a dinner ceremony here. The award is going to Mr. Woll this year in recognition of his vigorous leadership in the fight against slave labor all over the world.

Previous recipients have been Robert M. La Follette, John F. Finerty, A. Phillip Randolph, Rev. James Myers and Dr. Frank P. Graham. The award was named in honor of David L. Clendenin, a founder of the WDL and its

chief executive for five years. Mr. Clendenin died in 1941.

As chairman of the International Labor Relations Committee of the AFL, Mr. Woll has devoted major efforts for the revival of a free democratic trade union movement in Europe.

William L. Batt, Jr., radio commentator, and M. Herbert Syme, labor attorney, are co-chairmen of the committee of sponsors of the dinner at which the League's annual Honor Roll scrolls will also be presented.

Des Moines, Iowa. — A policy committee of 100 AFL leaders in this area are mapping out labor strategy in connection with new Iowa anti-labor laws.

### SPOTLIGHT FOCUSED ON GOP LABOR POLICY

Washington—The spotlight of publicity was focused on the official labor policy of the Republican Party, as revealed in the party's platform and in addresses and statements by party leaders, by Secretary-Treasurer George Meany of the American Federation of Labor in a coast-to-coast address Saturday night, May 24, 1947, over the NBC network.

Mr. Meany's speech — entitled "Who Makes Republican Labor Policy?" — pointed out that "even a casual examination of the record gives the lie" to claims by the supporters of anti-labor legislation that the joint Taft-Hartley-National Association of Manufacturers program of repression and emasculation of trade unions "represents the official policy of the Republican Party."

Revealing the sharp contrast between the actions of the Republican leaders in Congress — who are carrying the ball for the N. A. M. against the American workingman — and the 1944 Republican platform, the 1944 statements on labor by the Republican Presidential candidate, Governor Thomas E. Dewey of New York, and other and more recent G. O. P. pronouncements in the identical vein, Mr. Meany said: "The question naturally arises, in view of the actions of the official Republican spokesmen in Congress:

"Has the Republican party one policy on labor which it presents to the American people when it is seeking votes and another policy after it has been successful in taking control of the legislative branches of the government in Washington?"

"These spokesmen for the Republican Party on Capitol Hill must have a very low estimate of the intelligence of American workers. In addition, they must be convinced that the wage-earners of the nation have very short memories. Surely they must know that the workers of America — at least all of them over 30 years of age — remember quite vividly the late twenties and early thirties. If Messrs. Taft, Hartley and the N. A. M. boys desire to forget those days, I can assure them that the workers do not forget."

Taking up the claim of Congressional Republican leaders that their anti-labor actions are in response to an alleged election mandate, Mr. Meany said:

"Did any responsible representative of the Republican Party inform the voters prior to last November's election that the services of lawyers representing the National Association of Manufacturers would be utilized, as they were utilized, to write anti-labor laws for Mr. Hartley and his committee colleagues?"

"Did Senator Taft, or any other responsible spokesman for the Republican Party, tell the voters that the Republican leadership in the Senate would write anti-labor laws along lines suggested by employers? . . . I cannot recall the American voter being told prior to last November's election that employers were going to be allowed to dictate legislation to control the lives of workers."

"If there was a mandate to enact legislation such as that proposed by the Taft-Hartley program, it must have been a Secret Mandate. I am sure the great mass of the voters who went to the polls last election knew nothing of any such mandate."

The full text of Mr. Meany's address was as follows:

The attempt of reactionary big business and its Congressional collaborators to sell the idea of government domination and control as a means to industrial peace is an insult to the intelligence.

(Continued On Page 3)

### Anti-Labor Measures May Drop Full Ban On Welfare Funds

Washington, D. C. — Indications here after the second meeting of Senate and House conference groups on anti-labor legislation were that the conferees would agree on abandonment of an outright ban on union health and welfare funds.

Though no "final decision on anything were reached" at the second conference, Senator Taft of Ohio, chairman of the Senate Labor Committee and author of the Senate bill, expressed confidence that the outright ban on the union health and welfare funds, financed by employers, as adopted by the House, would be dropped. The bill passed by the Senate would bar only those solely administered by unions, but permit those directed jointly by union and employer.

Under this understanding, the fund collected by the United Mine Workers (AFL) would be permissible.

The Taft bill, approved by the Senate, 68 to 24, was somewhat milder than that passed by the House, 308 to 107, but contained many provisions deeply injurious to organized labor.

Discussing the tentative legislation which awaits Senate and House concurrence, President told a news conference that he is sticking to the four points he outlined to Congress in his State of the Union message last January. These called for:

1. Prevention of some jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts.

2. Expansion of the Labor Department's mediation and conciliation services.

3. Creation of a commission to study the entire field of labor-management relations.

4. Broadening of the social security program to "alleviate the cause of workers' insecurity."

The Senate bill does nothing about the latter point. It covers the others, but not in all cases the way the President suggested.

For example, Mr. Truman wants an expanded conciliation service within the Labor Department. The Senate bill divorces the service from the department.

The Senate bill would give the Federal Government the right by injunction to ban "national paralysis" strikes regarded as threatening the country's welfare. It would prohibit jurisdictional strikes, secondary boycotts and the closed shop and restrict the union shop.

The major differences between

the House and Senate bills are:

1. The House bill substantially prohibits industry-wide bargaining. The Senate bill doesn't touch this subject.

2. Private employers, under the House bill, would be permitted to obtain injunctions against unions for various "unlawful concerted activities" such as secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. The Senate bill in no case would permit private use of the injunction, although unions could be sued for simple damages for jurisdictional strikes and boycotts.

3. The House bill would impose upon the union shop very sharp restrictions not carried in the Senate bill.

4. The House bill, unlike the Senate bill, enters deeply into the internal union regulation.

5. The National Labor Relations Board would be abolished under the House bill.

6. Every strike would be made illegal under terms of the House bill unless the majority of the affected employees had voted for it in a rigidly prescribed manner. The Senate bill would place no limitations on the right to strike save in so-called "public interest" cases.

Features common to both measures, although not identical in all details include the outlawing of the closed shop, withdrawing rights to national unions with officers who are Communists, provision for Government injunctions in "public interest" strikes, transfer of the Conciliation Service from the Labor Department, establishment of "unfair practices" for unions, guaranteeing "free speech" to employers.

The measure approved by the House also would provide:

1. Establishment of a long list of "unlawful concerted activities by unions."

2. Place unions under the anti-trust acts.

3. Declare mass picketing illegal.

4. Ban political contributions by unions in national elections or primaries.

5. Make unlawful a strike or an "encouragement to strike" by Federal employees.

Boston—A "first" contract has just been signed here between employees of the Warhauser and Frank Co. and members of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union (AFL). Across-the-board wage increases of 10 per cent have been won.

### AFL LEADER SMOTHERS ANTI-LABOR ARGUMENTS MADE BY NAM CHIEF

Washington, D. C. — Points raised by Earl Bunting, President of the National Association of Manufacturers, in favor of the vicious anti-labor legislation pending in Congress were completely smothered by AFL President William Green in a dramatic Nation-wide debate over the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Taking up the points raised by Mr. Bunting, Mr. Green told the Nation:

"The National Association of Manufacturers is an organization dominated by the most reactionary, labor-hating interests in America. It is the real sponsor of the slave-labor provisions of the Taft-Hartley Bill. Let me cite a few of the black spots in the NAM's record:

"The NAM opposed the Child Labor Amendment, because in taking children out of school and putting them to work in factories, certain employers can cut wage costs. Isn't that a noble position?"

"The NAM opposed Social Security, bank deposit insurance, the Wage-Hour Act and the whole body of social justice legislation intended to make life a little better and safer for the great masses of the American people."

"Less than a year ago the NAM promised that prices would be reduced if only price controls were killed—and then its members proceeded to make a killing at the expense of the American people. "Today the NAM opposes legislation to provide millions of new homes for veterans and workers and instead it demands the abolition of rent control, a step which would subject every family living in a rented house or apartment to the mercies of profiteering landlords."

"This organization—the NAM—that has consistently fought in the past against every decent measure to protect the public welfare and is still battling against such measures, now has the effrontery to claim that the anti-labor legislation which it actively sponsors will serve the public welfare!"

"In view of the record, I think the American people have a right to view with suspicion anything that the NAM stands for."

"Mr. Bunting, the President of the NAM, has challenged me to answer two questions in this debate and I am more than glad to do so."

"First, he asks, 'Is one legitimate gain of labor denied in the proposed legislation?'"

"That question is almost childish. Congressman Hartley admits that his bill virtually repeals the National Labor Relations Act, which is labor's Magna Carta. Senator Taft admits that his bill has rewritten the National Labor Relations Act from beginning to end. These provisions alone distort and destroy the whole basis of free collective bargaining. For instance, Senator Taft's bill permits employers to say 'No' and keep on saying 'No' to all union proposals instead of requiring them to sit down and try to reach a friendly and co-operative agreement with the representatives of their workers. How could collective bargaining operate on such a basis?"

"Further than that, the Taft-Hartley program is aimed at destroying union security. It opens the doors wide to a flood of damage suits in the courts against unions. This would make it impossible for them to function effectively. It provides for a return of Government by injunction. That would compel free American

(Continued on Page 4)

### Shoe Workers Given Free Life Insurance

McSherrytown, Pa. — Complete free life insurance and hospitalization coverage has been won by District 50 of the United Mine Workers of America (AFL) from the Cannon Shoe Co. of this city.

The policy starts at \$500 for each employee, to be increased at the rate of \$100 each year until it reaches the maximum amount of \$1,500. This insurance policy includes coverage for accidental death and dismemberment.

Weekly accident and sickness benefits under terms of the agreement are \$10 a week from the first day of disability due to non-occupational accident and beginning the eighth day of disability due to sickness not covered by work-

men's compensation laws. The benefits continue for a maximum of 13 weeks during any one disability.

The policy includes payments for room and board during hospital confinement due to non-occupational accident or sickness up to a maximum of \$1 days. The policy provides for \$5 a day payment for room and board at the hospital. It also includes an additional payment of charges for hospital service during confinement up to a maximum of \$25.

Should a surgical operation be necessary in case of non-occupational accident or sickness, the policy authorizes payments up to a maximum of \$150.