

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Blackwell, Morton: Files
Folder Title: Solidarity Day (09/19/1981)
(2 of 5)
Box: 24

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

have become so unreasonable that many smaller businesses can't
 comply with all of the paperwork (Table 47). Sixty-nine percent
 agreed the excessive government spending is the primary cause of
 inflation (Table 50). Sixty percent agreed that federal courts
 have given so much approval to unreasonable environmentalist lawsuits
 that it is harder and harder for companies to build new factories
 (Table 49). And 57 percent agreed that government protectionism
 against imports only hurts American consumers by forcing up prices
 (Table 48). Some of these results are surprising in the light of
responses to other questions. Union members indicated a strong
 propensity for voting against candidates who do not support stronger
 health and safety regulations and curbs on imports -- even when those
 candidates held other positions with which the union members agreed
 strongly. A majority of union members also wanted unions to expend
 a lot of effort strengthening regulations against industrial pollution.
 These anomalies suggest that these issues would be a fertile area for
 any additional cross tabulations that might be done.

When presented with a series of statements typically made by
 political candidates who blame business corporations for the country's
 economic difficulties, union members agreed in proportions about
 equal to their responses to the statements blaming government. Seventy-
nine percent of the respondents agreed more or less or agreed strongly
 that the best way to balance the budget is to increase taxes of the
 big corporations and of wealthy people so that they pay their fair
share (Table 55). Seventy-eight percent agreed that stronger government

how to explain
 the contradictions
 between these
 percentages & the
 earlier
 findings
 above?

Indeed

Analysis of the working
 response items
 is
 important
 here.

response
 item
 Dis. due to
 G. planning

again - possible
Questionnaire
response bias
due to
wording →

regulations are needed to stop American companies from closing their factories and investing their money in foreign countries with cheap, non-union labor (Table 53). Sixty-two percent agreed that without stronger regulations, most businesses will sacrifice workers' safety in order to increase their profits (Table 52). And 56 percent agreed that the primary cause of inflation is excessive corporate profits (Table 54).

interesting

When it comes to blaming government, union members in the western part of the country agree more strongly with each of the statements except on the subject of protectionism, where their opinions closely match that of the rest of the membership. The union members falling in the lowest income group agree more strongly with the statements blaming government in each case. There is little difference by any other breakdown. Surprisingly, members of government unions are just as likely as others to blame government, and there is little difference in the blame placed by Republicans and Democrats.

Union members from rural areas are less inclined to blame business for the country's problems than are others, except on the issue of closing factories and investing overseas, where they lay blame on business in a proportion similar to the total membership. Black union members blame business in much higher proportions than do white members, as do Democrats than Republicans. As might be expected, the lowest income group feels strongly that the best way to balance the budget is to increase taxes of the big corporations and of wealthy people.

After hearing the series of arguments variously blaming government and business for the country's economic problems, respondents were asked whether they thought that there is too much government regulation of business, or not enough. The vote definitely came down on the side of too much regulation of business (Table 57). Forty-nine percent of the union members felt there was too much regulation of business, 24 percent felt there was not enough regulation, 7 percent felt that there was just the right amount, and 19 percent were uncertain. Several groups of union members were notably more positive in thinking that there is too much regulation of business. These were members of manufacturing unions, members living in the West, members living in rural areas, members who had lived at their current residences for more than 16 years, members who are 60 years of age or older, and members who identified themselves as Republicans.

Only black union members felt notably more strongly that there was not enough government regulation of business.

NOTE

more apt to think

higher %

6. Relative Ability of Political Parties to Solve Problems

The membership was divided about which political party in Congress is best able to solve our economic problems (Table 57).

✓ Thirty-two percent said that the Democrats are best able, 18 percent that the Republicans are best able, 32 percent said that neither party is able or that they are both equally able to solve our economic problems, and 18 percent didn't know. Somewhat more confidence in the Democrats ability to solve economic problems was placed by members of manufacturing unions, members living in the South, members with less than a high school education, black members, and members who identify themselves as Democrats. Somewhat more confidence in the Republicans was indicated by members of sales unions, members who had educations beyond high school, younger members, and members who identified themselves as Republicans.

Responses were still more evenly divided when members were asked which party in Congress is better able to solve our foreign policy problems (Table 57). Twenty-eight percent of the union members said that the Democrats could better solve foreign policy problems, 24 percent said the Republicans could, 26 percent said neither could solve them or they both would be equal in solving them, and 23 percent didn't know. The pattern of confidence among subgroups was exactly the same for foreign policy as it was for economic policy, with manufacturing unions, southern members, less educated members, blacks and Democrats indicating a higher level of confidence in the Democratic party and members of sales unions, higher educated and

7. Influences on Members' Opinions and Voting Behavior

Union members were presented with the possibility of various groups and individuals who might support a candidates' campaign for political office, and asked how the support of that group or individual would influence their inclination to vote for or against that candidate. The groups and individuals presented were business leaders, such as the U. S. Chamber of Commerce or the National Association of Manufacturers, a labor group, the oil industry, a conservative group, religious leaders, a civil rights group, an environmentalist group, a women's rights group, Ralph Nader, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson, and the local newspaper. The only groups or individuals that elicited strong responses from the membership were labor groups, which produced a strong positive response, and oil companies, which produced a strong negative response (Table 59, 60).

Twenty-seven percent of union members reported that support by a labor group would make them very much more inclined to vote for a candidate, and 38 percent indicated that support by a labor group would make them somewhat inclined to vote for a candidate -- for a total of 65 percent favorably inclined toward a candidate because of support by a labor group. Eight percent said that they would be inclined against a candidate supported by labor, and 27 percent said that they didn't know or that it depended. At the other extreme, 42 percent of union members said that they would be very much inclined to vote against a candidate supported by the oil companies, and

hostility to
big oil

younger members and Republicans indicating greater confidence in the Republican Party.

When the questions on economic problems and foreign policy problems are considered together, the results show a great deal of ambivalence among union members about the ability of either political party to solve the country's problems (Table 57). Only 22 percent of the membership answered that the Democrats would be best in solving both economic and foreign policy problems. Fourteen percent answered that the Republicans would be best in both areas. And 63 percent either split their answers, answered that neither party would be good or both would be equally good, or that they didn't know.

another 22 percent said they would be somewhat inclined to vote against such a candidate -- for a total of 64 percent inclined against a candidate because of oil company support. Nine percent said oil industry support would make them more inclined to vote for the candidate and 28 percent were unsure.

Support by business groups and by civil rights groups received a mildly negative response from the union members (Tables 58,63). If supported by a business group, 23 percent of union members would be favorably inclined toward a candidate, while 46 percent would be negatively inclined and 30 percent unsure. If supported by a civil rights group, 25 percent would be favorably inclined to vote for a candidate, 37 percent would be inclined to vote against him, and 37 percent didn't know.

There was some variation in response to support from a civil rights group between the various subgroups of union members (Table 63). Responses even more negative than the total response were registered by members of construction unions and members who live in the western region. Construction union members would be inclined to vote against a candidate supported by a civil rights group by a 42 percent (against) to a 19 percent (for) margin. Members living in the west would be inclined to vote against a candidate supported by a civil rights group by a 45 percent to 20 percent margin. Responses from members of government and service unions indicated a positive inclination to vote for a candidate supported by a civil rights group, as did members with over a high school education, younger members, and black members.

Left more
conservative -
construction
workers
more
conservative
Government
unionist
less
conservative

It is interesting that while 41 percent of black union members said that support from a civil rights group would make them more inclined to vote for a candidate, 22 percent said that such support would make them less inclined to vote for a candidate and 38 percent said that they didn't know or that it depended.

The influence of support from all other groups was evenly divided between those members who would be more inclined to vote for the supported candidate and those who would be less inclined to vote for that candidate. If the support was from a conservative group, 32 percent would be inclined to vote for the candidate, 30 percent against the candidate, and 37 percent didn't know (Table 61). If the support was from religious leaders, 29 percent would be inclined to vote for the candidate, 30 percent against the candidate, and 40 percent didn't know (Table 62). The only major variation in response to support from a religious group was among black union members, of whom 44 percent would be more inclined to vote for a candidate supported by a religious group and only 20 percent would be less inclined to support such a candidate. When the support comes from an environmentalist group, equal numbers of union members as a whole would be favorably inclined to vote for and against that candidate (31% for and 32% against) (Table 64). Again, however, there are differences by group. Members of construction unions and members living in the West would be less inclined to vote for the candidate, while members of government and service unions and younger members would be more inclined to vote for the candidate.

again -
West &
construction
more
conservative,
govt &
service
unions
more
liberal

Union members are also divided equally in their inclination to vote for a candidate when the support for the candidate comes from a women's rights group (Table 65). Construction union members and members living in the West are less likely to vote for the candidate, while members of government and service unions and members with higher incomes and educations are more likely to vote for the candidate. Women are slightly more favorable to a candidate supported by a women's rights group than men, but not as favorable as the other groups mentioned.

Ralph Nader also received a nearly even positive and negative influence rating from union members (Table 66). Union members living in the West indicated that his support would make them less inclined to vote for a candidate, while government union members, union members living in the northeast, union members with higher education, younger union members and Catholic union members indicated that they would be slightly more favorably disposed to a candidate supported by Nader. When the candidate's support was Daniel Patrick Moynihan, most union members had no opinion of the influence of his support (65%) (Table 67). Positive and negative influences were equally divided among the respondents with an opinion, with no major differences between groups. When the candidate was said to be supported by Henry "Scoop" Jackson, again most union members (59%) had no opinion about the influence on their voting (Table 68). Twenty-three percent indicated that they would be influenced to vote for the candidate and 18 percent that they would be influenced to vote against the candidate. Finally, 45 percent of

union members said that they were uncertain of the effect of support by their local newspaper, while the rest were evenly divided between the newspaper influencing them to vote for or against a candidate (Table 69).

Union members read a variety of magazines (Table 70). Thirty-four percent of the members report reading news magazines, 32 percent reading magazines about hobbies and recreation, 27 percent reading general interest magazines (such as Reader's Digest or People), 9 percent reading magazines about home, food or fashion, and 7 percent all other types of magazines.

Seventy-six percent of respondents reported that they did get a magazine or newspaper from their national or international union (Table 71). Only 55 percent of members of sales unions reported getting a national or international union publication, with all other industry divisions about equal in their receipt of such material. A slightly higher proportion of members in the South indicated that they received a national or international union publication.

Readership of the union publications was fairly high (Table 71). Of those who reported receiving a national or international publication, 51 percent reported that they nearly always read it, 23 percent that they read it about half the time, 18 percent that they read it occasionally, and 7 percent that they almost never read it. Older union members are more inclined to read the publications than are younger union members, but there is otherwise little difference among subgroups in readership.

Of those union members who receive a national or international union publication, 34 percent rated that publication as being very reliable, 54 percent as fairly reliable, 7 percent as not reliable, and 5 percent didn't know (Table 72 recomputed on the basis of only those receiving information). Older union members were more likely to rate the publication as very reliable, while most younger members gave it a rating of fairly reliable.

Union members were asked how much confidence they would have in information received about candidates for U. S. Congress from (a) their national or international union headquarters, (b) their state AFL-CIO, and (c) their own local union (Tables 73-75). The degree of confidence was about equal for information from each level with the majority of union members placing "only some" confidence in the information. If the information about the candidate came from the international or national union headquarters, 21 percent of the union members would place a great deal of confidence in the information, 59 percent would place only some confidence in it, 13 percent would place practically no confidence in it and 7 percent didn't know. For information coming from the state AFL-CIO, 20 percent would place a great deal of confidence, 60 percent "only some" confidence, 12 percent practically no confidence, and 8 percent didn't know. For information coming from the respondent's own local union, 22 percent would place a great deal of confidence in it, 54 percent "only some" confidence, 16 percent practically no confidence, and 8 percent didn't know. The degree of confidence placed in information about candidates

coming from any of the three union levels decreases with the level of education of the union members, that is, lower educated members are more likely to place confidence in the information than are higher educated members. As might be expected, Republicans are less likely to put confidence in the information than are Democrats.

Union members were then asked whether they ever do in fact receive information about candidates for the U. S. Congress from any of the three union levels (Table 76). Fifty-six percent of union members report receiving information from the international or national union headquarters, 48 percent report receiving information from the state AFL-CIO, and 62 percent say they have received information from their own local union. Thirty-two percent of union members say that they have received information from all three union levels, while 22 percent say that they have never received information from any level of union organization. Receipt of information about candidates from the headquarters level is reported to be highest among members of transportation unions (67 percent reporting information received), followed by communications, government, manufacturing, construction, service and sales unions (38 percent reporting information received). Receipt of information about candidates from the local union level is reported to be highest among members of communications unions (70 percent reporting information received), followed by construction, government, manufacturing, service, sales and transportation unions (56 percent reporting information received). Fifty-nine percent of union members in the South report receiving information from their state

AFL-CIO, as compared to 54 percent in the West, 44 percent in the northeast and 42 percent in the central part of the country.

8. The Role of Unions in Politics

The union members were asked a series of questions intended to elicit their opinion of the appropriate role of unions in politics. Between one-half to two-thirds of the members think that unions should engage in various activities related to congressional elections.

Sixty-eight percent of the members think that unions should send their members impartial information about candidates for the U. S. Congress (Table 78). Of those thinking that impartial information should be sent, about half (33% of the total sample) say that they would be very interested in receiving such information, another two-fifths say that they would be somewhat interested in receiving such information, and the rest would not be interested or don't know. Desire for impartial information is notably higher among members of government unions, of whom 78 percent think unions should send such information and three-fifths of that 78 percent indicate that they would be very interested in receiving the information. Desire for impartial information about candidates and interest in receiving such information increases with the level of education of the union member.

Fifty-nine percent of union members think that unions should conduct opinion polls among their members to find out which candidates for U. S. Congress the members support (Table 77). Slightly over one-half of those thinking that polls should be conducted (33% of the total sample) would be very interested in learning the results of those polls, and slightly over another one-third would be somewhat

NOTE ✓

Compare with
earlier studies

interested in learning the results. More union members in the South think that unions should conduct polls and would be interested in learning the results, as do more better educated members.

Note

✓ Fifty-nine percent of the union members also think that unions should endorse candidates for U. S. Congress (Table 80). Nearly one-half of those thinking that endorsements should be made (27 percent of the total sample) would be very interested in receiving information about their union's endorsement, and almost another one-half would be somewhat interested in receiving that information. Fewer members of sales unions (49%) and fewer Republican union members (48%) think that unions should endorse candidates or are interested in learning the results of such endorsements. A large proportion of members in the South (71%) and higher educated members than less educated ones (68% vs. 52%) are again more favorable to having unions endorse candidates and in learning about those endorsements.

NOTE

✓ Fifty-four percent of union members think that their unions should make recommendations to its members about whom to vote for in congressional elections (Table 79). Most of those favoring voting recommendations think that the recommendations should be made by a convention of all union members in the state, while about one-fifth think that such recommendations should be made by union leaders. A very small percentage think that the recommendations should be made by both union leaders and a convention and a few don't know. Slightly over one-half of those who think that voting recommendations should

be made would be very interested in learning about the recommendations and an additional two-fifths would be somewhat interested. Somewhat higher percentages of members of government unions, members living in the South and higher educated than lower educated union members are favorable to unions making voting recommendations to their members, while fewer Republicans want their union to make recommendations.

Union members are far less favorable to union political activity when their own pocketbooks become involved. Only 34 percent of the members said that a union should ask its members for financial contributions for its political campaigns, either on behalf of particular candidates or particular issues. Of that 34 percent, slightly over one-half (18 percent of the total sample) said that less than \$10 would be a reasonable amount to ask members to contribute to the union's political campaigns. Another one-fourth of those who felt soliciting contributions would be appropriate (8 percent of the total sample) think that \$10 to \$20 is appropriate, almost none thought that a larger amount would be appropriate, and the rest didn't have an opinion. Again, more government union members, more members in the South, more higher educated union members and in this case more higher income union members think the unions should solicit financial contributions for political activities.

Most union members think that their unions should make a great effort to get their members to register and vote, some effort to hold meetings for their members to hear competing candidates for Congress, some effort to send letters to their members listing the candidates for

as this
interview
with C.
Wolfe's
fresh?

Note:
his relative to
union
not does
money

again -
engage w/
Wolfe's

Congress they endorse, some effort to call union members on the phone just before election day to remind them to vote, somewhat less than some effort to hand out leaflets for candidates at work, shopping centers and polling places, and virtually no effort to make personal visits to members' homes on behalf of candidates. For each activity, members of government unions and members in the South want more effort expended on each activity except calling members on the phone to remind them to vote, for which they want efforts expended in a proportion about equal to the total membership. Black union members and members who vote a straight Democratic ticket want their unions to expend more effort on these activities to get union members involved than do other groups. There is no relationship between the amount of effort that a member thinks should be expended and education of the member, however, as there was for the previous set of questions on the types of activities in which unions themselves should engage.

Involvement of Union Members in Politics

A small proportion of union members report that they have ever been involved in political election activities, either as individuals, through their unions, or through any other groups. Sixteen percent reported that they had attended meetings or rallies to hear candidates speak. Twelve percent have handed out leaflets for candidates at work, at the polls or at places like shopping centers. Eleven percent have participated in a drive to get people registered. Eight percent have called people on the telephone just before election day to remind them to vote. and 7 percent have called on people in their homes on behalf of candidates. A hardcore of 6 percent of union members reported that they had participated in all of the above mentioned political activities. As might be expected from the responses to the earlier questions, a higher proportion of members of government unions, members living in the South, higher educated, black union members and members who vote a straight Democratic ticket are politically active. The highest level of political activity was reported by black union members, of whom 16 percent said that they had participated in all six types of political activities.

Forty-two percent of union members have contributed money to a candidate for some political office. Notably fewer members of sales unions have contributed funds, while a large number of union members in the West report contributions, and the proportion of union members reporting contributions increases with income and education. The 58 percent of the members who have not made contributions are divided

between 17 percent who have been asked to contribute money but have not done so and 41 percent who have never been asked or who don't remember being asked.

When political activity and giving of money are considered together, 15 percent of union members have both engaged in at least one political activity and have given political contributions, and an additional 33 percent of the membership has either engaged in political activity or given money. The remainder, 53 percent of the union membership, is completely inactive politically.

Union members were asked to suppose that they were making a political contribution to their union. They were asked whether they would want that money used for specific legislation or for candidates for political office. A majority of union members -- 58% -- said that they would want the contribution used for specific legislation. Twenty-one percent would want the contribution used for candidates for political office. Of that 21 percent, about one-half indicated that they would prefer to specify the candidate for which it was used, while the other half would prefer to leave it to the union to use for candidates it endorses. Finally, another 21 percent of the members said that they didn't know or didn't care how they would prefer the contribution to be used. A few differences appear on this question between subgroups. Service union members are more interested in having their contributions used for legislative issues and less interested in having them used for candidates. Fewer members of construction unions wanted the money used for legislation and more didn't know or didn't

07/10/09
7 sample



care how the money was used. Lower educated members also were less likely to want the money used for legislation and more likely not to care.

By more than a two-to-one margin, union members think that business contributes more money to political candidates than does labor. Fifty-nine percent of union members think business contributes more money than labor, while 25 percent think labor contributes more money than business. Four percent think that business and labor contribute the same amount, and the rest think it varies or don't know. Higher income and higher educated union members are more likely to think that business contributes more than labor, while nearly equal proportions of women think that business contributes more than labor and that labor contributes more than business.

Members' Registration and Voting

Sixty percent of the union members are already registered to vote in the November, 1980 election (Table 93). Another 35 percent say that they intend to register, with only 4 percent saying that they will not register and 1 percent uncertain. The sixty-one percent who are already registered break out into 47 percent who have been registered longer than 10 years, 8 percent who have been registered 5 to 10 years, 4 percent who have been registered 2 to 5 years, and 2 percent who have been registered less than 2 years. Fewer numbers of sales union members, members in the West, members who rent their residences, and younger union members are already registered, but in each case nearly all of those not registered say that they intend to

register to vote in November. A much larger percentage of those over 60 years of age are already registered (77%), of whom nearly all have been registered longer than 10 years.

All members who are registered or who intend to register (95% of the sample) were asked whether they considered themselves a Democrat, a Republican or an Independent, regardless of how they are registered (Table 95). In response to this question, 47 percent of the members said they considered themselves to be Democrats, 13 percent said they considered themselves Republicans, 30 percent said they considered themselves Independents, and the rest gave other responses or didn't know. Of those who considered themselves Democrats, somewhat less than one-half (21 out of 47 percent) reported that they usually vote the straight party ticket. Very few of those who consider themselves Republican say that they vote a straight party ticket. Those members who said that they considered themselves to be Independent or something other than Republican or Democratic were also asked if they were registered or intend to register as a Republican, a Democrat, or some other way. Of the 36 percent falling into this category, 11 percent are registered or intend to register as Democrats, 6 percent are registered or intend to register as Republicans, and 19 percent are registered as some other party or independent or don't know. Thus a total of 58 percent of union membership identified itself as Democrats either by inclination or by registration and 19 percent identified themselves in some way as Republican.

A smaller proportion of members of sales unions identified themselves as Democrats, as did a smaller proportion of union members who had lived at their current residence for less than four years. A larger proportion of union members in the South identified themselves as Democrats. Members in the South were also more likely to vote a straight Democratic ticket. Members with higher education were less likely to identify themselves or be registered as Democrats than members with less educations, as were younger members than older members. Black union members were more likely to be Democrats than were whites. In each case, however, the difference was made up by a larger proportion who considered themselves or were registered as something other than Republican or Democrat rather than by a greater proportion of Republicans. Slightly higher proportions of Republicans were found among Protestants than Catholics and among members in the western part of the country than in other regions.

Nearly all of the union members who are registered or intend to register also intend to vote in November (Table 96). Eighty-three percent say that they almost certainly will vote, 8 percent that they probably will vote, and 5 percent that they may not or probably won't or don't know.

Demographic Characteristics of Union Members

The proportion of union members living in the city and in the suburbs is roughly equal, with somewhat fewer living in rural areas (Table 97). Thirty-seven percent of members say they live in the city, 36 percent that they live in the suburbs, and 25 percent that they live

in rural areas. Service union members are more heavily concentrated in cities with fewer in rural areas, as is true for black union members. (Blacks are more heavily represented in service unions than in any other industry grouping.) A higher proportion of union members falling in the lowest family income category also live in cities with fewer living in suburbs and the same proportion living in rural areas as is true for the total sample. A higher proportion of members of communications unions live in the suburbs than in cities or rural areas, as do more union members who live in the South and members whose family income is in the middle range. Union members over 60 years of age are more likely to live in cities than in either suburbs or rural areas.

✓ Eighty-four percent of union members own their own homes, 15 percent rent their residences and 1 percent report other arrangements (Table 98). Home ownership is highest among members in the South, members in rural areas, and members with family incomes over \$25,000. Home ownership is highest among members in the 40-59 age group and lowest among members under 40. A smaller number of members of sales unions report owning their homes and more report arrangements other than owning or renting. Since sales union members are far younger than the members of other industry groups (36% below 30), many probably live with their parents. Home ownership is also notably lower and the proportion renting higher among black union members.

Most union members tend to have lived at their current residence a relatively long time (Table 98). Twenty-six percent report longer than 20 years at the same residence, 15 percent report 16 to 20 years, 14 percent 11-15 years, 20 percent 6-10 years, 9 percent 4-5 years, 11 percent 2-3 years, and 5 percent one year or less. It should be noted, however, that the lag time in updating national or international union membership files and the difficulty in finding telephone numbers for those who move frequently could have caused an underrepresentation of union members who had been at their current residences for a relatively short period of time.

Nearly one-half (47%) of the households in which the union members lived had more than one working member (Table 99). More households had multiple wage earners than had one member working. Forty-one percent of the households had one working member, 33 percent had two working members, 9 percent had three working members, and 5 percent had 4 or more working members. There was no working member in 12 percent of the households, nearly all of which occurred in interviews in which the union member was over 60 years of age. As might be expected, only 15 percent of families with incomes under \$15,000 per year had multiple wage earners, as compared with 43 percent of those with incomes between \$15,000 and \$25,000 and 72 percent of those with incomes over \$25,000. Only 26 percent of the incomes over \$25,000 came from a single working member. The proportion of households with multiple wage earners tended to increase with the level of education of the union member. About equal proportions of men and

women union members lived in single and multiple wage earner families, as do about equal proportions of white and black union members.

Family incomes under \$15,000 per year were reported by 23 percent of the union members, incomes between \$15,000 and \$25,000 by 36 percent of the members, and incomes over \$25,000 by 34 percent of the members (Table 100). A slightly greater proportion of members of communications and government unions report incomes in excess of \$25,000. Lower incomes are reported by those members who rent their residences. Education of the union members is clearly related to family income. Of those members who have not graduated from high school, 43 percent report family incomes below \$15,000 and only 14 percent incomes above \$25,000. Of those with educations beyond high school, only 13 percent report incomes below \$15,000 and 48 percent incomes above \$25,000. Two forces are clearly at work here, however. Not only would a higher educated person be expected to earn a higher wage, but it was also found that the proportion of multiple wage earner families was lowest among those with the least education and highest among the highest educated members. As might be expected, 49 percent of members over 60 years of age report incomes under \$15,000. As was shown on Table 1, 51 percent of retired members have family incomes under \$15,000, 11 percent incomes between \$15,000 and \$25,000, and 13 percent incomes over \$25,000. The lower incomes of women workers are also evident in this data. Thirty-six percent of women have incomes of less than \$15,000 as compared to 20 percent of men, and 23 percent of women have incomes above \$25,000, as compared to

note

37 percent of men. The difference between white and black union members was small, with slightly fewer black union members having incomes above \$25,000. There were no income differences between Republicans and Democrats.

Most union members were either high school graduates or had some college or trade school beyond high school (Table 101). Nine percent of union members had an eighth grade education or less, 15 percent had only completed some high school, 45 percent were high school graduates, 21 percent had some college or trade school (13-15 years), 5 percent were college graduates, and 3 percent had some postgraduate training. Nearly all of the union members with postgraduate education were members of government unions, as were more than one-third of those with college degrees. Those with less than a high school education were primarily clustered in construction and manufacturing unions. Older union members were far less educated than younger ones; a full 44 percent of members 60 years of age and older had not finished high school. Women were seen to be somewhat less educated than men, with 31 percent of the women not having finished high school as compared to 23 percent of the men. Finally, 36 percent of those who say they vote a straight Democratic ticket had not finished high school.

Thirteen percent of the union members interviewed were in their twenties or below, 20 percent were in their thirties, 22 percent were in their forties, 23 percent were in their fifties, 18 percent were in their sixties, and 4 percent were older (Table 102). Members of sales unions were notably younger than the other union members, with 36 percent in their twenties or below. As was mentioned above,

lower income and lower educated union members tended to be older than other union members.

Nine percent of the union members interviewed were black, 90 percent were white, and 1 percent reported that they were something else (Table 103). Blacks were much more heavily represented in service unions (19%) and somewhat more represented in government (14%) and transportation (13%) unions. There were far more black members in the South (18%) than in any other region. A higher proportion of women (14%) than men (8%) union members were black.

Seventeen percent of union members consider themselves to be members of an ethnic group (Table 103). That 17 percent is broken down into about 5 percent Irish, 3 percent German, 2 percent Italian, 1 percent Hispanic, and a scattering of all other mentions. (Not shown on tables.)

Forty-seven percent of the union members interviewed said that they were Protestant, 35 percent Catholic, 1 percent Jewish, 11 percent some other religion and 5 percent had no religious affiliation (Table 104). More members in the northeast are Catholic, while more members living in the South and in rural areas are Protestant. As was noted above, there is a higher proportion of Protestants among Republican union members than among Democrats. There are more Jewish union members working in government than in any other industry.

Men made up 80 percent of the sample interviewed and women 20 percent (Table 105). A higher proportion of women were found in sales unions (41%), communications unions (39%), service unions (32%) and government unions (27%). Only 6 percent of the construction

20

union members and 8 percent of the transportation union members were women. As was mentioned above, more women had lower incomes and less education, and a higher proportion of black union members were women.

Finally, 31 percent of the union members interviewed live in the northeast, 16 percent in the South, 34 percent in the central part of the country, and 19 percent in the West.

Description of Survey

The purpose of this survey is to explore the political opinions and attitudes of a cross section of AFL-CIO union members. Results are provided by type of union and by region, as well as by various demographic variables.

To accomplish this each AFL-CIO union was assigned to one of seven broader groupings, i.e., manufacturing, construction, government, sales, transportation, communications and service. (See table following this section.) Enough names were randomly drawn from each industry grouping to give a final sample size of approximately 150 interviews. The results of the survey are shown independently for each of these seven industry groupings.

150 per industry group

ok ✓ The national totals for the survey results were derived by weighting the industry groups by the proportion their membership bears to the total AFL-CIO membership. The national results may thus be said to represent the views of AFL-CIO members in the United States.

The national results based on a sample of 1,035 have a maximum expected error of ± 3 percentage points, while the results for the seven industry divisions with a sample of approximately 150 each have a maximum expected error of ± 8 percentage points. ✓

The interviewing was conducted over the telephone by trained and experienced interviewers during the first three weeks of July 1980. Only designated union members were interviewed.

Questions relating to the personal characteristics of the respondents were asked in addition to the questions on attitudes and opinions. The results of the survey was cross tabulated by these characteristics. They are income, education, age, race, religion, sex, place of residence, type of residence and political party affiliation.

The results of the survey are also broken down by four geographic regions of the country: East, South, Midwest and West. The states comprising each of these regions are also shown in tabular form below.

Regional Divisions

<u>East</u>	<u>South</u>	<u>Midwest</u>	<u>West</u>
Maine	Kentucky	Ohio	Oklahoma
New Hampshire	Tennessee	Indiana	Texas
Vermont	Alabama	Illinois	Montana
Massachusetts	Mississippi	Michigan	Idaho
Rhode Island	Delaware	Wisconsin	Wyoming
Connecticut	Maryland	Minnesota	Colorado
New York	District of Columbia	Iowa	New Mexico
New Jersey	Virginia	Missouri	Arizona
Pennsylvania	West Virginia	North Dakota	Utah
	North Carolina	South Dakota	Nevada
	South Carolina	Nebraska	Washington
	Georgia	Kansas	Oregon
	Florida		California
	Arkansas		Alaska
	Louisiana		Hawaii

AFL-CIO Unions by Industry Division

Manufacturing

Aluminum Workers International Union
Bakery, Confectionery and Tobacco Workers International Union
The United Brick and Clay Workers of America
United Cement, Lime and Gypsum Workers International Union
International Chemical Workers Union
Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union
Coopers International Union of North America
Distillery, Wine and Allied Workers International Union
International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers
United Furniture Workers of America
United Garment Workers of America
International Ladies' Garment Workers Union
United Glass and Ceramic Workers of North America
Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada
American Flint Glass Workers Union
American Federation of Grain Millers
United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers International Union
Allied Industrial Workers of America, International Union
International Jewelry Workers Union
International Leather Goods, Plastics and Novelty Workers Union
Leather Workers International Union of America
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers
Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America
Mechanics Educational Society of America
Metal Polishers, Buffers, Platers and Allied Workers
International Molders and Allied Workers Union
International Union of Allied Novelty Production Workers
Oil, and Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union
United Paperworkers International Union
Pattern Makers League of North America
United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America
United Steelworkers of America
Stove, Furnace and Allied Appliance Workers' of North America
United Textile Workers of America
International Woodworkers of America

Construction

International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers
International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftsmen
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
International Union of Elevator Constructors
International Union of Operating Engineers
International Association of Bridge and Structural Iron Workers
Laborers' International Union of North America
International Union of Wood, Wire and Metal Lathers

International Brotherhood of Painters and Allied Trades of the United States and Canada

Operative Plasterers' and Cement Masons' International Association of the United States and Canada

United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada

United Union of Roofers, Waterproofers and Allied Workers

Sheet Metal Workers International Association

Tile, Marble, Terrazzo Finishers and Shopmen International Union

International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers

The Granite Cutters, International Association of America

Transportation

Air Line Pilots Association

International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers

Flight Engineers' International Association

International Longshoremen's Association

Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees

National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association

National Maritime Union of America

American Radio Association

Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada

Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees

American Railway Supervisors Association

Seafarers International Union of North America

Brotherhood Railroad Signalmen of America

American Train Dispatchers Association

Amalgamated Transit Union

Transport Workers Union of America

United Transportation Union

Upholsters' International Union of North America

Railroad Yardmasters of America

Communication

National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians

Communications Workers of America

Graphic Arts International Union

The Newspaper Guild

International Typographical Union

Government

International Association of Fire Fighters
 American Federation of Government Employees
 National Association of Letter Carriers
 International Union of Police Associations
 American Postal Workers Union
 International Plate Printers, Die Stammers and Engravers Union of North America
 American Federation of School Administrators
 International Association of Siderographers
 American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
 American Federation of Teachers
 Utility Workers Union of America

Service

Barbers, Hairdressers and Cosmetologists' International Union of America
 International Union of Journeymen Horse Shoers of United States and Canada
 Insurance Workers International Union
 Laundry and Dry Cleaning International Union
 Service Employees International Union
 Associated Actors and Artistes of America
 American Federation of Musicians
 Office and Professional Employees International Union
 International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers
 International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture
 Machine Operators of the United States and Canada

Sales

United Food and Commercial Workers International Union
 Hotel and Restaurant Employees' and Bartenders' International Union
 Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union



By Press Associates, Inc.

EMBOLDENED by a conservative political climate, reactionary forces in the land have launched an all-out drive to enact a singularly vicious piece of legislation.

Employing scare language conjuring up a specter of union-inspired violence, the National Right to Work Committee is spearheading a campaign to make strike-related "violence," or the threat of such violence, a federal crime.

This means that a striking worker involved in a picketline scuffle, or whose words or gestures were perceived as threatening, could be hauled into court by federal prosecutors, fined \$10,000 and handed a 20-year prison sentence.

TO THIS END, Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.), who chairs the Senate Judiciary Committee, has introduced a bill to amend a 1946 federal anti-extortion law known as the Hobbs Act. Thurmond's amendment would extend the act and its penalties to include labor disputes.

The Thurmond amendment, which 12 conservative Senate Republicans have co-sponsored, would overturn a 1973 Supreme Court ruling that union activities do not fall under the Hobbs Act. It was introduced in the House by Rep. J. Kenneth Robinson (R-Va.) with 32 GOP and five Democratic co-sponsors.

To drum up public and congressional support for the Hobbs amendment, the Right to Work Committee has pulled out all the stops.

In a mass mailing to some 2 million potential contributors to its ultra-conservative cause, the committee charges that "union terrorism" is on the rise and that, as a result of this terrorism, "hundreds of thousands of America's working men and women are prisoners of the pick-handle closed shop."

In addition, the right-wing committee has started a new publication called "Violence Task Force Report—A Monthly Probe Into Compulsory Unionism Violence."

To top it off, the committee is trying to buy TV time for its new 30 minute scare film—"The Specter of Violence."

To rebut the distortions, the AFL-CIO has produced a six-minute film which any TV station airing the Right to Work Committee film will be asked to broadcast under the federal Fairness Doctrine.

PROponents OF the Hobbs Act amendment sometimes try to conceal their aims by claiming it would apply to employers as well as employees. But it wouldn't work that way since extortion, as prohibited in the Hobbs Act, means taking something material from someone else. Since the worker, not the employer, is trying to gain something material by striking, the employer in effect would be exempt from the amendment.

As a labor expert on legislation sees it, "if an employer or his agent went out to the picket line and threw a punch, he would be subject to state and local prosecution, whereas an employee who hit back would be subject to federal prosecution and far greater penalties."

The amendment would apply not only to actual violence but to "what somebody perceives to be a threat on the other end," the labor expert noted. "If someone says he was threatened by what somebody said or by the way he held his picket sign, we have an instance which might be subject to prosecution."

EXISTING state and local laws provide adequate sanctions against violence, whether on the picket line or the ball field.

Furthermore, the pro-amendment scare propaganda ignores the fact that strike-related violence is so rare that the FBI's comprehensive statistics on crime don't even include a category for it.

By imposing an unnecessary and slanted federal role on top of local law enforcement, Hobbs amendment proponents aim to put a damper on strikes and strikers.



By Press Associates, Inc.

WHEN BISMARCK RULED imperial Germany a century ago, he reportedly remarked that people shouldn't see either sausages or laws being made. The point was well illustrated in a session of the House of Representatives on June 26.

Following a rancorous five-hour "debate" which often bordered on pandemonium, the House approved the broadest package of budget legislation in memory—a one and one-half inch thick compilation of fine print which had been handed to House members shortly before the session began.

The legislators, by their own admission, did not have time to read or study the 1,000-page compendium, which had been thrown together at the last minute, with some sections hastily crossed out and others penciled in the margins.

YET WITH SOME cajoling from President Reagan, who proved to be as skillful with the telephone as with television, the House passed by a 217 to 211 vote the so-called "Gramm-Latta" substitute to the budget legislation its own committees had devised.

The Administration's astonishing victory was made possibly by the defection to GOP ranks of 29 House Democrats, most of them southern conservatives. All but two Republican members were held in line.

The Gramm-Latta legislation is similar to that approved by the Senate. Both versions whittle down or repeal many of the social programs enacted since the 1930s and seriously strain the "safety net" for the needy which Reagan had pledged to maintain.

As Rep. John Conyers (D-Mich.) told his colleagues during the debate in reference to the Gramm-Latta substitute: "The three branches of government will have become two. The White House will not only propose legislation, but also dispose of it. . . . Major changes in the law are being stamped through Congress without any deliberative process."

Rep. Mary Rose Oaker (D-Ohio) pleaded that "opposition to the Republican substitute is not merely a sour grapes phenomenon. The Gramm-Latta bill will abrogate the authority and function of the House authorizing committees. I do not exaggerate when I charge that adoption of these amendments constitutes a blatant threat to our entire checks and balances system."

Rep. Thomas M. Foglietta (D-Pa.) declared, "I cannot, and I will not, go along with this mockery of the legislative process." The "budget process," he said, "is being used as an excuse to implement major policy reversals. The President's block grant proposal is the most prominent example."

THE VOTE FOR Gramm-Latta only compounded the rout of the Legislative branch by the Reagan-led Executive Branch which began when the House voted in May for a "bipartisan" budget resolution sponsored by Texas Democrat Phil Gramm and Ohio Republican Delbert Latta. The 63 conservative Democrats who joined a solid GOP provided a comfortable margin of victory.

That resolution, the original Gramm-Latta measure, mandated House authorizing committees to make \$36.6 billion in social program cuts. Congress thus complied with the Administration's desire to turn the budget process on its head by forcing congressional committees to shape programs and rewrite legislation to conform to previously determined spending ceilings.

Rep. Richard Bolling (D-Mo.), chairman of the House Rules Committee, warned that "If the Administration's insistence that it have its own way—and at once—through the reconciliation process continues, it will be a gross distortion of the intent of those who wrote the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, as well as the intent of the 1974 budget act."

Bolling continued: "If Congress is to be reduced to automatons permitted only to ratify a presidential legislative agenda that has been pre-masticated by an all-powerful executive, the American people, with some justice, may very well ask: 'Why should we support this expensive anachronism?'"



By Press Associates, Inc.

ONE OF THE FIRST things Dwight Eisenhower did when he became president in 1953 was to appoint a blue-ribbon commission to find out why the federal government was growing, ostensibly at the expense of the states.

The panel reported back that federal programs were being created because of the inability or unwillingness of the individual states to meet people's needs.

Today, the durable advocates of "states' rights" finally have one of their own in the White House.

The Republican Party's view of history, as laid out in its 1980 platform, is that the Democratic Party brought about "Big Government" and did it "under the guise of providing for the common good."

TO TURN THINGS around, President Reagan has proposed a "new federalism" which would convert scores of specific programs into "block grants" and turn them over to the states—whether they want them or not, whether they are able to administer them or not.

At the same time, federal funding for these consolidated health, education, community development and social service programs would be cut 25 percent initially, or at least 35 percent if inflation is figured in.

A coalition of 63 national organizations—including civic action, civil rights, consumer, senior citizen, religious and labor groups—recently held a briefing on Capitol Hill to explain what block grants would mean to their various constituencies.

The categorical grant programs, it was recalled, weren't set up at the whim of Washington bureaucrats, as critics imply. They evolved after years of study and debate out of real needs which were not being addressed by the states.

Some examples are the Title I program to help educationally deprived children, aid to handicapped students, legal services for the needy, low-income energy assistance, community and mental health services, and clinics for migrants and black lung victims.

Under the block grant proposal, federal money would be handed over to the states to use as they please under broad, undefined areas of education, health and the like.

There are no standards nor requirements for adequate record-keeping and reporting, and thus no way for Congress or anyone else to evaluate how programs are working.

There is no requirement that these federal funds not be used to substitute for state funds that would otherwise be used for the same purpose.

As a coalition member observed, the Reagan block grant approach would turn the competition for public funds over "to a brutal political struggle where the most vulnerable and least powerful groups are almost certain losers."

As he sees it, "the handicapped will be pitted against the aged, foster care parents against child care advocates, and black lung victims against mental health patients."

THE BLOCK GRANTS, if enacted, would "set the stage for even deeper cuts and less accountability in the future," it was predicted. It was noted that Reagan said in March that "block grants are only the intermediate steps" in his so-called "new federalism."

Congressional committees in both houses recently have taken a skeptical look at the Reagan block grant package and have rejected many parts of it.

However, further battles on the issue loom in committees and on the floor of the House and Senate. More citizen education and vigilance is needed to get the message to Congress that the federal government must not abandon to the states its responsibilities to the needy and the powerless.



By Press Associates, Inc.

THE UNITED STATES has nearly 8 million people actively seeking work and unable to find it. While the underlying economy is strong, high interest rates and reduced federal spending probably will add to the unemployment rolls in the period ahead.

Against this background, the Reagan Administration is seriously considering a plan to import hundreds of thousands of Mexican nationals to work in America's factories, mills, stores and offices.

These new jobseekers would be called, in the euphemism of the times, "guestworkers."

THE AIM OF the White House is not to "soak up" the illegal or undocumented workers already in this country who are variously estimated to total 2 to 12 million. Rather, it is to develop a new program as part of a "North American Accord" to improve relations with Mexico. It also may give President Reagan a card to play when he discusses Mexican oil, gas and other matters when he meets with Mexico's president in June.

If domestic unemployment is not enough to dissuade the Administration, then it might learn something from the experience of western Europe.

As Europe recovered from World War II and unemployment was near zero, many countries began importing foreign or "guest" workers for lower-paid menial jobs, ostensibly on a temporary basis.

THE EUROPEAN migration grew to a total of some 30 million people. The members of the Common Market were the chief receivers, except for Ireland and Italy. The chief labor-supplying nations were Ireland and Italy, along with Portugal, Spain, Finland, Greece, Turkey and Yugoslavia. Algeria, Sudan and Morocco became labor exporters in the 1970s.

The recruiting of "guest" workers stopped with the 1973-74 energy crisis and rising unemployment. The problem then became one of trying to persuade the "guests" to go home while integrating those who had settled.

If the lessons of Europe are too remote, there are experiences closer to home.

A task force of the National Committee for Full Employment has urged the Reagan Administration not to repeat the "disasters" of past programs which exploited Mexican workers.

The bracero program that operated from 1942 to 1963 brought hundreds of thousands of campesinos to work for U.S. agribusiness, the task force recalled, and it did not help U.S.-Mexican relations.

Ernesto Galarza, in his classic "Merchants of Labor," examined in fine detail how an efficient system of administered migration was developed by the United States and Mexico to supply labor to agribusiness. The Mexicans were docile, cheap and captive. Americans lost job opportunities, and farm labor unions were kept weak. There was corruption and collusion between growers and officials. It was a big success, but not worthy of a great democracy.

IN THE 1950s, when Congress periodically considered what could be done about the bracero problem, Galarza proposed an ambitious bi-national Rio Grande Valley development program to absorb Mexico's unemployed and build harmony between the two nations. That was never done and the United States remains the "safety valve" for job-hungry Mexicans.

Today, members of the Full Employment Committee's Task Force are urging the Reagan Administration to act constructively on the "undocumented" worker problem instead of pursuing the "guestworker" plan. They would offer a two-layered amnesty plan: "green card" or commuter status for the more senior undocumented workers and H-2 or temporary job status for others.

It is to be hoped that President Reagan will choose to work on the problem at hand rather than create new ones.



By Press Associates, Inc.

THE SCARE CAMPAIGN mounted by the Reagan Administration against the social security system surely must be one of the more irresponsible actions by national leaders.

Most responsible observers are aware that social security has a short-term and a long-term problem.

The short-term problem is directly related to the stagflation of recent years. High-level unemployment caused a reduction of employer-worker payments into the fund while inflation caused a sharp increase in benefits paid out.

The long-term problem will come when the post-World War II baby boom generation reaches the retirement age around the year 2011.

The present contrived crisis developed last spring when Reagan budget chief David Stockman saw an opportunity to exploit the short-term problem.

Using the bankruptcy rhetoric, he apparently talked Reagan into proposing a wide range of cuts to "save" social security.

THE WAVE OF anger that swept the nation persuaded the Senate to slap down Reagan's major proposal, 96-0, in a sense of the Senate resolution.

What led the Administration to miscalculate so badly?

Wilbur J. Cohen, chairman of the new Coalition to Save Our Security and a former Secretary of Health, Education & Welfare, gave this explanation:

"The major reason for the Reagan-Stockman proposal to cut social security is to meet the two goals of increasing expenditures for defense while at the same time promising to balance the budget.

"Because the federal unified budget includes general revenue expenditures from the U.S. Treasury as well as social security payments from earmarked trust funds, every penny cut from any aspect of social security payment permits Mr. Stockman to recommend higher military spending while still claiming he's balancing the budget."

The social security cuts also enable Reagan and Stockman to cover losses of federal revenue from tax cuts in the event the Reagan economic recovery strategy fails to work.

COHEN RECOMMENDED that social security — and also state unemployment insurance — be completely removed from the Federal Unified Budget to thwart the Stockman maneuver.

A CBS-TV special aired July 16 showed that a good deal of misinformation is at large about social security, especially among the young. The New York Times the next day ran a story on a Times/CBS News poll with the headline, "Poll Shows Americans Losing Faith in Future of Social Security System."

Little wonder. The CBS-TV special showed conservative politicians and normally fair-minded reporters wallowing in hyperbole. Problems were "gargantuan" and "horrendous" and the situation was a "time bomb." Health & Human Services Sec. Richard Schweiker saw everybody jumping aboard the disability "gravy train."

BROOKINGS INSTITUTION expert Henry Aaron calmly noted that 70 percent of those who apply for disability benefits are denied them. And half of that group never works again, he said.

CBS commentator Dan Rather salvaged the program by concluding that constructive solutions exist and Congress will choose among them.

It was left to Rep. Claude Pepper (D-Fla.) to wonder why the Reagan Administration wants to take benefits away from young survivors, from the crippled, from the low-income families. "Does the government of the United States have to do that?" he asked.



By Press Associates, Inc.

HEADY WITH SUCCESS in pushing its budget and tax program through Congress thus far, the Reagan Administration is expected soon to press for congressional approval of a scheme which a recent study says "would mean the most rapid and massive transfer of money from one sector of the economy to another in American history."

As with the Administration's budget and tax proposals, what one critic called "the missing piece" of the Reagan economic package—the decontrol of natural gas—would benefit the wealthy at the expense of working people and the poor.

In the case of gas decontrol, those who would reap the benefits are those who are least in need—the 20 largest oil conglomerates who own more than 60 percent of the nation's natural gas reserves.

While further bloating the wealth and power of the oil giants, decontrol would result in massive job loss, higher inflation, and extreme hardship for lower income and elderly persons who use natural gas for heating and cooking and who already pay from 35 to 50 percent of their income for energy.

FOR THE 60 PERCENT of American households which depend on gas, prices would at least double—to an average of over \$1,000 a year.

These expected consequences are explained in a study prepared by an independent research firm and released in late June by the Citizen/Labor Energy Coalition. The 200-organization coalition is launching an educational and lobbying campaign to fight gas decontrol.

Under current law, natural gas prices will increase each year until 1985, when they will be deregulated and allowed to rise to the equivalent OPEC oil price. The President has the authority to continue controls two years beyond 1985.

During his campaign for President, Reagan advocated gas decontrol. Budget Director David Stockman and Interior Sec. James Watt are pushing for immediate decontrol, an even more extreme alternative to the existing law than accelerated decontrol. Accelerated decontrol would boost gas prices at a much faster rate than the current schedule allows.

UNDER ACCELERATED decontrol, the coalition study warns, 3.4 million jobs would be lost over the next four years in every major sector of the economy: retail and wholesale trade, agriculture, transportation, services, and manufacturing. This is because homeowners and tenants will pay an additional \$86 billion for gas and will have that much less to spend on consumer purchases.

Of the 157 industries studied, only three would have a net gain of jobs: oil and gas well drilling, oil and gas exploration, and oil field construction machinery—all of them highly capital intensive rather than job-creating.

Also, business would have less capital available for job-creating investment and revitalization of the economy. Many smaller businesses would be forced to shut down, accelerating the already high rate of bankruptcies.

Decontrol will help only the oil and gas companies which already are awash with record profits far in excess of investment needs. These companies have so much extra cash that they have been busy gobbling up other companies and increasing their already immense economic power.

Their economic power also means political influence, and these energy giants long have been adept at electing their friends to Congress. During the 1980 elections, oil and gas industry PACs spent over \$6 million.

The American people must make it clear to Congress that they will not tolerate a huge ripoff which will hurt all consumers and which serves no purpose except to increase further an already dangerous concentration of economic and political power.

Labor Cites Ready Cure For Deficit

The AFL-CIO challenged the scare tactics being used by the Reagan Administration to justify its proposed cutbacks in social security protections and called on Congress to allay fears by guaranteeing payment of all earned benefits.

"We do not accept the unfounded allegations that the system is bankrupt now or will be in the future," AFL-CIO Social Security Director Bert Seidman testified before a Senate Finance subcommittee.

CHAIRMAN William Armstrong (R-Colo.) had opened the hearing with a warning that "social security is going broke." His source was a gloomy report by the three social security trustees—all members of the Reagan Cabinet—that the system will run out of money if unemployment and inflation stay high.

Seidman retorted that the immediate funding problems can be overcome without cutting back benefits, and the solution recommended by the AFL-CIO—using general revenues to fund 50 percent of Medicare hospitalization insurance—"would finance the various social security programs well into the next century."

Seidman accused the Administration of exaggerating the system's temporary funding imbalance in order to twist the social security program "to serve its political, philosophical and budget objectives." The proposals the Administration has made "go far beyond legitimate concern about the program's financing," he testified.

DEMOCRATS ON the subcommittee suggested that the Administration wants to cut down social security benefits far deeper than would be needed to keep the program solvent so that the surplus funds could be used to reduce the federal budget deficit. Social security payroll taxes show up on the revenue side of the budget; benefit payments are shown as expenditures.

(Continued on Page 7)

'Scare Tactics' Charged To Social Security Foes

(Continued from Page 1)

Health & Human Services Sec. Richard S. Schweiker was also questioned sharply about the economic assumptions it used to project a massive future deficit in the social security funds. For that purpose, Sen. Bill Bradley (D-N.J.) noted, the Administration assumes a continuation of very high unemployment and very high inflation. But for other economic projections, it foresees both rates dropping.

In Detroit, Auto Workers President Douglas A. Fraser said the Reagan Administration appears to be conducting an "orchestrated attempt to undermine confidence in the social security system and to establish a basis for the outrageous cuts which it proposed in May."

Seidman protested the "cruelty" of showing doubt as to whether workers who pay into the system will ever get benefits from it.

"IT IS inconceivable that Congress would let social security benefits be delayed or unpaid," Seidman stressed.

Therefore, he suggested, Congress should write into law "a provision stating that social security benefits, like interest on the national debt, will be paid from general revenues in the event payroll taxes are insufficient. The present moral obligation to pay benefits should become a legal one. This would reassure beneficiaries and contributors, and strengthen public confidence in the program."

He reminded the panel that a similar provision was included in the Social Security Act more than 30 years ago.

AS TO THE Reagan Administration's cutback proposals, Seidman said the harsh effect of slashing early retirement benefits would be compounded by further tighten-

ing eligibility for disability insurance.

Under the Administration plan, Seidman protested, no worker retiring at 62 would get a social security benefit as high as the official poverty threshold.

Seidman expressed labor's concern that the extreme severity of the Administration's proposals may increase the willingness of Congress to accept cuts "that are somewhat less drastic than the Administration's recommendations."

THAT APPEARS to be the Administration's "fallback strategy," Seidman said, and the various retrenchment proposals being talked of in Congress "give evidence that this strategy has been much too successful."

He told the Senate panel that the AFL-CIO is opposed to any increase in the age of retirement. Tampering with the early retirement provisions of social security places "an unequal burden on those in poor health and on blue-collar workers whose jobs require physical effort," Seidman protested. They would also have a "devastating impact on the early retirement provisions of collectively bargained pension plans," he observed.

Living standards of the elderly are declining under inflation's impact even with the present cost-of-living formula for social security benefits, Seidman noted.

HE AND OTHER union and senior citizens witnesses testifying at the hearings took sharp issue with the Administration insistence that general revenue funds not be used to supplement the payroll tax.

"The United States is one of the few advanced industrial nations in the world in which the social security system is financed almost entirely from payroll taxes," Seidman noted.

The AFL-CIO proposal to finance 50 percent of Medicare out of general revenues would allow the balance of the Medicare tax to be applied to the Old Age & Survivors Trust Fund, the basic retirement benefit fund.

AS A FURTHER backup, Seidman said, other transfers and reallocation among the various funds would provide needed flexibility. And, as former President Carter proposed in 1977, general funds should supplement the payroll tax during periods of exceptionally high unemployment.

"The AFL-CIO recognizes the need for strengthening the financing of the program," Seidman testified. "But we believe this can and should be done without re-



LABOR'S SUPPORT for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment was reaffirmed by AFL-CIO Sec.-Treas. Thomas R. Donahue in Washington, a focal point of the June 30 nationwide ERA rally. Donahue was joined in addressing

the 3,000 ERA supporters across from the White House by Florine Koole of the Communications Workers and Joycelyn Thompson of the Machinists. Alan Alda, right, a member of the Screen Actors, keynoted the Washington rally.

TURNING CLOCK BACK

Reagan budget aims at poor, unemployed

THIS MONTH, I am using as my editorial the following analysis of the impact of the Reagan administration's economic program. This short but comprehensive analysis was prepared by the AFL-CIO's Industrial Union Department.

The real issue of the Reagan budget is not whether it will cure inflation, which it probably won't, but what it does to the relationship between the American people and our government.

According to our new Administration, the root of our economic trouble is the federal government. Get the government off our backs by reducing government programs, the President says, and people will solve their problems on their own.

FUNDAMENTALLY it is a denial of 50 years of history. Almost a half-century ago, at the time of the Great Depression and the New Deal, America made two basic decisions: first, that we had a responsibility to help those in need, and second, that we could best exercise that responsibility not through individual acts but through government programs. We made those decisions partly out of our humanitarian heritage, and partly out of the hard-won knowledge that all of us benefit from a healthier and happier society.

No one today would claim that every government program is 100 percent on target or that there is not one ounce of waste in the government colossus. But on the other hand, no one should claim that the government itself is the problem, or that our needs will disappear if government activity is scaled down.

The particular tragedy of the Reagan budget is that in reversing a half-century of experience, it takes special aim at the poor, the disadvantaged, and the unemployed.

THE LIST OF proposed cuts is long and dismal: job training, public service jobs, special jobs programs for youth, unemployment insurance; special educational programs for the disadvantaged, assistance to poor students; help for small business, cooperatives, housing rehabilitation, rural electrification, family farmers; food stamps, school lunches, certain social security benefits, help for single-parent families and for the disadvantaged, health services.

The Reagan administration economic program is an attempt to turn back the clock to the 1920s and earlier, and, like all efforts to turn back the clock, it is doomed to failure.

The second issue is whether the budget cuts will cure inflation. Cut expenditures, balance the budget, end inflation—that's the conservative pitch. It sounds reasonable, and, according to the polls, it has obviously influenced a lot of Americans.

THE TROUBLE is that it's false. There is no evidence that an unbalanced budget causes inflation, or that a balanced budget will help cure it. In past years the United States has had unbalanced budgets without inflation—and we've had inflation with balanced budgets. The same thing has been true of other industrialized nations. Inflation and the government budget are not necessarily related.

Administration spokesmen are fond of saying that if the typical American family planned its budget like the government, it would go broke. The fact is that few American families could survive on a balanced budget. If we couldn't borrow money to buy houses and automobiles, most of us would be living in tents and walking to work.

Instead of reducing inflation, some of the budget cuts could well fuel more inflation. Inflation is partially caused by the decline in productivity, which in turn can be traced to inadequate research, bad management and the deterioration of our industrial base, such as energy and transportation facilities.

BY REDUCING support for railroads and mass transit, for urban reconstruction, low-cost housing, rural economic growth, and the development of alternate energy and water resources, the Administration program will undermine our efforts to improve productivity. That could lead to more inflation.

Then the Reagan program will be exposed for what it is, an effort to reallocate the nation's resources away from those at the lower end of the economic ladder into the hands of special interests, big business, and the wealthy.

EDITORIAL COMMENT FROM THE PRESIDENT, THOMAS F. MIECHUR



'Some budget cuts could fuel inflation...'

'Hard bargaining' brings new contract

PORT CLINTON, OHIO—A total one-year package of 62.5 cents, including an 8-percent wage increase, was negotiated here for the 115 members of Local 206 who work for the Celotex Corp.

The agreement came "after some hard bargaining," reported the local's financial secretary, Robert Love. Int. Rep. William Smith and Dist. Rep. Kenneth Pack assisted the local, whose bargaining team, led by Local 206 Pres. Joseph Mitchell, included Charles Miller, Raymond Crayton, Robert Druyor, Ted Velliquette, and Joseph Busby. The local accepted the contract overwhelmingly in a vote April 30.

In addition to the 8-percent wage increase, the pact calls for a shift-differential increase from 15 and 25 cents to 17 and 30; a \$1 pension hike, from \$8.75 to \$9.75; sickness and accident benefits from \$110 to \$120 a week; term life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment, from \$7,000 to \$8,000; and major-medical coverage increased from \$50,000 to \$75,000. Also, jobs in five maintenance classifications were increased by five cents an hour.

Officers of Local 206, in addition to Mitchell and Love, also include Henry E. A. Forss, recording secretary.

UAW votes reaffiliation

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Sixty-two percent of the delegates to the United Auto Workers' last convention have approved taking the "necessary steps" toward reaffiliation with the AFL-CIO.

The executive board of the 1.2-million-member UAW had recommended the move, and will be expected to work out the final terms with the AFL-CIO and perhaps get it wrapped up at a board meeting in June.

The UAW and its president, the late Walter Reuther, had a major role in the unification of the CIO (Committee for Industrial Organization) and the AFL (American Federation of Labor) in 1955. But the Auto Workers pulled out of the federation in 1968, primarily because of disagreements between Reuther and the late George Meany, AFL-CIO president at that time.

In recent years, the Auto Workers and the AFL-CIO have worked closely on a number of important issues, noted Douglas Fraser, UAW president. These

(Continued on page 17)



CHARLES BARNES, Local 426, Chicago Heights, Ill., was honored at a recent membership meeting for his 10 years of service to the local as its president. Barnes is at the right in the photo above. At left, presenting the gavel and pen set, is new Pres. James Jones. Others are Trustee Roosevelt Harris, left center, and Rec. Sec. Theodore France III, right center. Local 426 represents the workers at the Flintkote plant in this Chicago suburb. (Photo by Local 426 Fin. Sec. Anthony Foushi)

SOLIDARITY

Contributions aid Local 369

EDMONTON, ALTA.—Contributions to CLGAW Local 369 here, on strike against Canada Cement Lafarge until the contract settlement reported in the last issue of the Voice, totalled \$2,870, the local's financial secretary, E. O. Pawl, has reported to the international union.

The contributions were as follows: \$300, Local 479, Invermere, B.C.; \$250 each, Local 454, Brookfield, N.S., and Local 502, Atlanta, Ga.; \$200, Local 345, Calgary, Alta.; \$100 each, Local 31, Union Bridge, Md.; Local 130, Tampa, Fla.; Local 324, Havelock, N.B.; Local 376, Kutztown, Pa.; Local 387, Picton, Ont.; Local 392, Miami, Fla.; Local 400, Vancouver, B.C.; Local 461, Macon, Ga.; Local 471, Gorman, Calif.; and Local 480, Charlevoix, Mich.

Also, contributing \$50 each were: Local 46, Santa Cruz, Calif.; Local 52, Tehachapi, Calif.; Local 206, Port Clinton, Ohio; Local 237, McIntyre, Ga.; Local 394, Brantford, Ont.; Local 397, Foreman, Ark.; Local 532, Masonstown, W. Va.; and Local 535, Newberry Springs, Calif.

Locals contributing \$25 each were: Local 75, Fredonia, Kans.; Local 102, Okay, Ark.; Local 124, Dallas, Texas; Local 164, Cape Girardeau, Mo.; Local 191, South Norfolk, Va.; Local 294, Havelock, Ont.; Local 306, Lakefield, Ont.; Local 327, Corner Brook, Nfld.; Local 334, Santa Clara, Calif.; Local 375, Paulding, Ohio; Local 405, Clarkdale, Ariz.; Local 559, Corner Brook,

Nfld.; \$10, Local 81, Dixon, Ill.; Local 427, Redding, Calif.

Other organizations making contributions, Pawl reported, were \$50 each, IAF, AFCW, and MHDLC, while PSAC contributed \$10.

Local 279 agrees

JOPLIN, MO.—A ninth holiday, doubling of the shift differential over three years, an improved pension factor, and across-the-board wage increases of \$1.60 an hour during the contract period were highlights of the new agreement between CLGAW Local 279 and Eagle-Picher Industries, Inc.

The new pact, in effect May 1 this year, covers 107 workers, reported Int. Rep. Harold L. Louis, who assisted the local in bargaining.

Wage increases are 55 cents May 1 this year, 50 cents on the same date next, and 55 cents on May 1, 1983. The shift differential goes from 12 and 14 cents to 18 and 21, then to 21 and 25, and in the last year, to 24 and 28 cents. There is a one-cent increment increase on May 1, 1982, and the pension cap, now at 35 years, is also removed on that date. The pension factor rises from \$7 to \$8.50 through the years, at 50-cent increases each year. The local accepted the new contract overwhelmingly on April 30.

Officers of Local 279 include Pres. Steve Stokes, Rec. Sec. George Odell, and Fin. Sec. Scottie Hackleman.

Senate Shifts Focus

Rights, Labor Measures Sidelined for Tax Debate

The Senate put off action on controversial civil rights and trade union issues to take up the Reagan Administration's multi-year tax cut package—a labor-opposed measure heavily tilted to reducing taxes paid by corporations and the wealthiest individuals.

Put on the back burner—possibly until after the August recess of Congress—is a military construction bill reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee. It would exempt military construction contracts from the Davis-Bacon Act, which requires payment of prevailing wages and benefits on federally funded construction.

LABOR SUPPORTERS in the Senate had indicated such a proposal would call for "extended debate," the Senate euphemism for a filibuster.

A low-keyed filibuster on a school busing issue did result in the Senate leadership's decision to set aside a Dept. of Justice authorization bill until after the tax legislation is passed.

While Congress has regularly expressed its distaste for busing as a means of overcoming racial imbalance and the effects of past segregation, it has so far stopped short of interfering with court actions based on the Constitution, or on Justice Dept. enforcement of constitutional rights.

THE FILIBUSTER was aimed at an amendment that would bar federal courts from ordering a student assigned or bused beyond the nearest school and would allow the Justice Dept. to file suits on behalf of students they believe have been subjected to court-ordered busing in violation of the restriction.

A letter to senators from AFL-CIO Legislative Director Ray Denison said the proposal "attempts to deny the federal judiciary its appointed role in enforcing the Constitution" and in effect would let Congress overrule Supreme Court constitutional decisions by a majority vote.

Six Democratic and six Republican senators joined in a letter to their colleagues opposing the amendment. Two attempts to invoke cloture failed, and the bill was set aside temporarily. But the second vote produced 54 senators for closing debate, just six short of the 60 votes needed under Senate rules. A third try is expected soon after the tax bill is off the Senate floor.

A **SENATE LABOR** subcommittee has approved two bills opposed by the AFL-CIO, but the full Labor & Human Resources Committee has not yet taken them up.

One measure would largely repeal the eight-hour-day provisions that are written into laws governing federal procurement, service and construction contracts. At present, contractors must pay overtime after eight hours in one day. The subcommittee bill would allow straight-time pay either for up to 10 hours a day on a four-day, 40-hour workweek, or for nine hours a day for four days in a week with four hours of work on the fifth day.

The other union-opposed measure awaiting full committee action would transfer coverage of sand, gravel, clay and stone mining from the more stringent standards of the Mine Safety & Health Administration—which includes mandatory inspec-

tions and safety training—to the general jurisdiction of the Occupational Safety & Health Administration.

EVEN AS the Senate was starting debate on the Reagan tax cut bill, the largest House-Senate conference in congressional history was getting under way on the budget reconciliation bill—the program cuts and changes in law that have been adopted to assure that federal spending does not exceed the budget ceiling voted by Congress.

Actually, more than 40 conference subcommittees will deal with differences between the House and Senate versions affecting legislation coming under the jurisdiction of the various committees.

While the Administration dictated much of the contents of both the House and Senate bills, some of the differences affected programs of importance to labor generally or to unions with special concerns. Unemployment insurance, the future of the Conrail system, funding for Medicaid and the future of the low-income weatherization program are among the scores of issues to be resolved.

THE TAX BILL debate in the Senate found the Democratic minority divided on what changes, if any, to seek in the Administration bill. The most closely contested issue, in fact, appeared to be an amendment supported by a majority of the Senate Finance Committee that would vastly increase future revenue loss to the government by indexing tax brackets to the inflation rate.

The AFL-CIO asked senators to oppose that amendment because it would perpetuate existing inequities and commit the government to a tax cut each year—even beyond the three years of tax cuts provided by the Senate bill. "Such a measure would seriously undermine any future efforts to achieve tax justice," the AFL-CIO said.

THE HOUSE Ways & Means Committee, meanwhile, continued to shape a "Democratic" tax bill that would be even more generous to business interests than the Administration plan but would tilt individual tax cuts somewhat more to middle-income and lower-income households.

In one controversial action, the House committee voted to allow professional commodity speculators to continue to benefit from a complex tax avoidance device called a "straddle" involving the juggling of contracts to buy and sell various commodities. That's a loophole that the Reagan Administration, as well as labor, had urged Congress to close.

CWA Delegates Rap Reagan On Economy, Social Security

Boston—The economic problems of the nation formed a dominant topic of debate and discussion at the 43rd annual convention of the Communications Workers here with the Reagan Administration drawing heavy criticism for mishandling the economy and seeking severe reductions in the social security program.

Calling social security a "40-year contract between American workers and the federal government," CWA delegates insisted in a resolution that there are "better, more responsible ways" to restore fiscal health to the system and eliminate waste than the proposals of the Reagan Administration.

THE CONVENTION called on President Reagan and Congress "to concentrate their efforts on finding an equitable method of financing our social security program."

CWA President Glenn E. Watts, in his opening address, set the tone for the week when he assailed the Administration's economic policies as "by and large, the economics of big business applied to government. The aim is to run a government of the corporation, by the corporation and for the corporation."

Other speakers sounded similar themes, including AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland, Massachusetts Senators Edward M. Kennedy and Paul Tsongas, House Speak-

er Thomas P. O'Neill and National Urban League President Vernon Jordan.

JORDAN WENT to the Bible to describe his view of the Reagan approach to domestic issues facing America's working people: "To those who have, to them shall be given. To those who have not, even that which they seem to have shall be taken away."

The ideal test of a budget, Jordan said, "should be whether it meets the needs of the nation while providing poor people with opportunities to join the mainstream. This budget fails that test."

In other actions, delegates adopted a resolution calling for more stringent penalties in criminal cases involving the use of firearms.

The delegates also spoke out strongly on the issue of sexual harassment in the workplace, supporting "the efforts of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to keep sexual harassment as a proper matter for Title VII anti-discrimination enforcement."

ON THE CLOSING day of the convention, Watts announced that CWA's Committee on the Future—established by CWA Executive Board action to visualize "what the future holds for American society, for CWA and for organized labor"—will hold its first meeting beginning July 30 in Chicago.

One member from each of the union's 12 geographic districts was elected to the committee during the convention week. These 12 rank-and-file members will have votes, while Watts was given authority to vote in the event of a tie and to serve as chairman. Other CWA officers and staff—appointed by Watts—will have seats without voting rights on the committee.

The delegates, after lengthy discussion, also placed before the committee the task of considering CWA's public image and its logo, or seal.

Traveling by Domeliner
is one of the
happiest habits
I've ever acquired.

Ronald
Reagan

"Union Pacific Domeliners certainly are the answer to the modern conception of luxury travel. I find they offer a wonderful opportunity to relax while enjoying service as superb as the surroundings."



"Dome dining? That's for me! It's one of the extras I can enjoy on a Domeliner."

"Another thing—I like my comfort. Take the new Pullman accommodations, for example. For six footers like me, the wide long-length beds assure a good night's rest. And, during the day, I have a 'private room' where I can study scripts or just take it easy, as though I were home."

"The relaxing moments in beautiful lounge cars, the leisurely enjoyment of the trip and the thoughtful service all add up to my being such an enthusiastic Domeliner fan."

Mr. Reagan is a frequent guest on the "City of Los Angeles" Domeliner. The "City of Portland" Domeliner, in service between Chicago and the Pacific Northwest, provides the same attractive Dome cars and modern Pullman equipment. Ride Union Pacific Domeliners and we feel sure that you, too, will become an ardent Domeliner traveler.

DEPENDABLE PASSENGER AND FREIGHT SERVICE

**UNION
PACIFIC**
Railroad
Omaha 2, Nebraska

What he did for ~~love~~ MONEY

This was an advertisement used by the Union Pacific Railroad back in 1959 when future President Ronald Reagan took money to say how much he loved railroad passenger trains.

He doesn't say that anymore, as virtually any Amtrak worker can tell you. Instead, he is working very hard to kill

passenger service in the United States—a move which would make this nation the only so-called civilized, industrial nation on the face of the earth WITHOUT good rail passenger trains.

Our Aunt Effie, who is sometimes shocked at Reagan's antics, was mortified by this ad. "Strange," she said. "He loved us when he was collecting cabbage from the UP. Now he says he's got to kill us for the good of the budget. What about the good of the people?"

"Maybe," she mused, "Maybe we could talk Amtrak into letting him do an Amtrak ad. Maybe that's all he needs to love us again. More income from ads."

A Facade of Equity

The Administration tax program is presented with a facade of "equity" for individuals and "neutrality" for corporations. It is neither.

The bulk of the benefits of the individual tax cut go to those individuals in the highest income brackets—nearly 30 percent to the top 5 percent. By contrast, the program we support would give 60 percent of the benefit to the vast majority of taxpayers who earn less than \$30,000 a year.

It is neither equitable nor fair for the government to grant almost \$17,000 in tax cuts over the next three years to an individual earning \$100,000 a year, while those earning the median family annual income of \$20,000 receive less than \$1,500.

By the same token, those corporations with the highest earnings—oil companies, the communications industry and other capital-intensive firms—would gain the lion's share of the business tax cuts. Those industries facing the most critical needs—such as auto and steel—would get little benefit.

With persistent high unemployment, the nation needs jobs. Yet the Administration proposal concentrates its benefits on larger, more prosperous, capital-intensive firms with little potential to increase employment.

It seems to us a more prudent use of tax dollars to encourage investments that will increase employment opportunities, especially in hard-pressed urban areas. The 10-5-3 depreciation allowance speed-up is not a program to encourage investment; it is a

program to shift the tax burden from corporations onto the backs of individuals.

Given the current state of the American economy, we see absolutely no reason why the government should reward any company for purchasing equipment from abroad. Speeding up depreciation allowances on Datsuns would only speed up the deterioration of the American automobile industry.

Because we are also concerned about the consequences of locking the economy into a three-year tax cut, the AFL-CIO supports a one-year tax cut. Any further changes should be based on experience, not guesswork.

The alternative we support provides a greater share of tax relief to those low and middle-income families who need help now. It provides tax relief for smaller, more labor-intensive companies ignored by the Reagan proposal. And it targets other business tax incentives to those areas and industries, new and old, that most need help.

This alternative recognizes that tax burdens are too high for many, but not all individuals; that some industries need tax relief, but not all.

Most importantly, it also avoids the economic peril that could result from shackling the country to one set economic approach that, at best, is highly questionable.

—From AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland's testimony before Senate Finance Committee.

Kirkland Hits Reagan Plan As Unfair

AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland pressed Senate tax-writers to take a fresh look at labor's proposal to link business assistance to the nation's reindustrialization goals and to use a payroll tax credit to alleviate inflation's burden on America's workers.

Kirkland went before the Republican-led, conservative-dominated Senate Finance Committee to challenge the Reagan Administration's tax proposals as unfair, inflationary and wasteful.

HE SCOFFED at the "supply-side" notion that giving substantially bigger tax savings to the wealthy will send them rushing to invest in new plant and equipment.

And he protested business tax cuts that would heap unneeded windfalls on corporations with the highest earnings, reward companies for purchasing equipment abroad and further shift the tax burden from corporations to individuals.

Kirkland outlined the labor-supported alternative, which has been introduced in the House by two members of the Ways & Means Committee—Frank J. Guarini (D-N.J.) and William M. Brodhead (D-Mich.).

IT WOULD give every wage and salary earner a tax refund equal to 20 percent of social security payroll deductions. For this year, the maximum tax reduction would be \$395 for a one-earner household and \$790 for a two-worker family.

(Continued on Page 3)

Labor's Tax Alternative Tied to Aid for Workers

(Continued from Page 1)

Employers would be given a 5 percent tax credit on their share of the payroll tax.

Business assistance would be channeled through a tripartite board to the goal of "revitalization and rehabilitation of the nation's basic industries and economically distressed areas," Kirkland said.

"The alternative we support provides a greater share of tax relief to those low and middle-income families who need help now," Kirkland told the committee.

"IT PROVIDES tax relief for smaller, more labor-intensive companies ignored by the Reagan proposal. And it targets other business tax incentives to those areas and industries, new and old, that most need help."

Even members of Congress who have gone along with the Administration's spending cut demands have questioned the President's call for a three-year series of tax cuts, mounting to 30 percent.

The AFL-CIO shares that concern "about the consequences of locking the economy into a three-year tax cut," Kirkland said. Any further reductions, he urged, "should be based on experience, not guesswork."

SERVICE EMPLOYEES President John J. Sweeney also testified before the Senate panel in opposition to the Administration tax bill.

"The President's program will not pro-

vide real tax relief for the overwhelming majority of service workers," Sweeney said. "In fact, most of our members will be paying a larger share of their income in taxes under the plan because of inflation and increased payroll taxes."

But the U.S. Chamber of Commerce testified that it "strongly supports" the Administration tax proposal.

Labor Leaders Question Radical-Right Politics Of Moral Majority

Many leading US trade unionists are beginning to question the goals and the methods of the Moral Majority and other religious-oriented New Right groups who suggest that God has told them there is only one Christian point of view regarding such matters as arms control, defense spending, television and book censorship, the Equal Rights Amendments, and even trade union organization and representation.

Several union leaders have endorsed and are now actively supporting a counter-group known as "People for the American Way," which is headed by writer and producer Norman Lear. If you were watching television last fall, before the November elections, you may have seen the series of television spots sponsored by "People For" which attempted to counter the intolerant messages of the Moral Majoritarians. One spot showed a hard-hat steel worker who looked directly into the camera and said:

"Hi. I have a problem. I'm religious and I come from a religious family. But that don't mean we see things the same way politically. Now here come a whole bunch of ministers on the radio and TV and in the mall—trying to tell us on a whole bunch of political issues that if we don't agree with them, we're not good Christians—or we're bad Americans, or we're anti-family.

"Now, according to their list, my wife is a poor Christian on a couple of issues and she's a good one on some others. My boy is a bad Christian on a couple of issues my wife is good on, but he's good on a couple she's bad on. And lucky me, I'm 100% Christian because I happen to agree with them ministers on all of it.

"Now my problem is this: my boy, I know he's a good Christian. And my wife? Tell you the truth, she's a lot better than I am. So there's gotta be something wrong when anyone, even if it's a preacher, tells you that you're a good Christian or a bad Christian depending on your political point of view. That's not the American Way."



The prime mover behind People for the American Way, is television producer Norman Lear, right, shown discussing his organization's program with General Secretary John Rogers and Director of Organization Jim Parker.

Union Labor Pays Bills, Business Agent Reminds

Have you seen a check made out by a union member in payment of a debt which says in one corner, "This payment made possible by union labor.?"

They're beginning to appear around the country, and Fred Burgess, business agent of Local 916, Aurora, Ill., reminds us that there should be more of them. "We need to advertise," he adds.

The Los Angeles, Calif., Union Label Council and other label groups around the US and Canada are now distributing small peel-off, adhesive-backed labels with the suggestion: "Stick one of these labels on each check you write. Let your community know the importance of the union dollar."

24

AFL-CIO Board Meeting to Focus on 'Solidarity Day'

AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland has called an August 6 meeting of the federation's General Board, comprising the president or principal officer of each of the 102 affiliated unions, to discuss plans for the September 19 "Solidarity Day" protest demonstration in Washington.

The meeting will be held in the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Chicago following sessions of the AFL-CIO Executive Council, August 3-5.

"The American labor movement must provide national leadership in the present struggle to protest and advance our country's social and economic progress," Kirkland said in a letter to General Board members. The meeting will examine "how best to mobilize our efforts in behalf of union members and those who share our concerns for a more just society," he added.



SOLIDARITY DAY Coordinator John Perkins (a member of the United Brotherhood) and staff members assigned to various phases of the AFL-CIO's September 19 demonstration in Washington, display a blow-up of the official emblem of the event. From left: Maureen Houston, Janet Hyland, Maria Boyle, Perkins, Wilbert Williams, Kevin Kistler, Frances Kenin, Dick Wilson and Charlie Hughes. Also on the staff is Marvin Caplan.

THE CARPENTER

Reagan Appointments Pacify Right Wing

A couple of months ago, the *Conservative Digest* magazine, published by "new right" direct mail whiz Richard Viguerie, devoted almost an entire issue to lambasting the Reagan personnel operation.

The complaint was that Reagan was not appointing enough ideological ultra-conservatives to his staff or to the agencies of government. Other rightist groups, leaders and publications joined the chorus.

There's been a sudden halt in all that crabbing.

The right-wingers are now satisfied with the way things are going in administration appointments. Small wonder. At least 45 appointees identifiably their colleagues, buddies and fellow-travellers of the right have moved into administration positions. There are probably a great many more than that, enough to lead the *Washington Post* to report the "White House personnel office is quietly putting a distinctly conservative stamp on the departments and agencies of the Reagan administration . . . putting ideologically committed adherents into critical, though not always highly visible, sub-cabinet positions."

This should not register on the Richter Scale, because it is not earth-shaking. After all, Reagan cam-

paigned promising appointments that would please the right.

He has, for example, placed into administration positions a cadre of graduates from Young Americans for Freedom. YAF was the spawning ground for most of the present top leaders of the "new right" like Richard Viguerie, its founder; Paul Weyrich of Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress; Terry Dolan of National Conservative PAC; Howard Phillips of Conservative Caucus.

Other appointees are or were associated with the American Conservative Union, which has led the fight for repeal of OSHA; with the ultra-conservative think-tank, the Heritage Foundation, founded and funded by union-busting brewer Joe Coors; with the United States Industrial Council (formerly the Southern States Industrial Council), for decades one of the most rabidly anti-union business and corporate groups in the country; with the Intercollegiate Studies Institute, a campus ultra-conservative group; with the American Legislative Exchange Council, a national organization of right wing state legislators; with Conservative Caucus, one of the most effective of the "new right" PACs, with the National Right to Work (for less) Committee.

Military Madness

WASHINGTON WATCH



"This is sheer madness," warned Oregon Republican Senator Mark Hatfield, chiding his colleagues for approving funds for a new kind of nerve gas weapons system—"a system that could bring disaster to this earth."

"Is there no limit," asked Hatfield, "to the voracious appetite of the military machine that wants to suck up every dollar we have?"

The Reagan Administration's disturbing — even frightening — answer seems to be a resounding "no", with Congress pretty much concurring.

Blaming the federal government for inflation, Reagan now wants spending slashes of \$174 billion over the next three years. Most of this, as you know, will come from social programs that care for and protect Americans.

But in the same breath, increases in military authorizations totaling \$94.2 billion are planned!

In other words, over 54% of the funds to be slashed from food stamps and revenue sharing and medicaid and CETA aren't going to the war on government spending.

They're going to the war machine!

And the Congressional Budget Office warns that the administration is



underestimating the cost of its military projects, by tens of billions of dollars.

Long forgotten are voices like the House Republican Study Committee which came up with \$14.7 billion in proposed military spending cuts.

Instead, a twisted logic reigns that sees military solutions to most problems and even talks of the feasibility of using nuclear weapons.

The logic is epitomized by a Reagan spokesperson, justifying increases in military and sharp decreases in non-military foreign aid spending.

The military aid supposedly can help poor countries "alleviate the economic and social causes of (domestic) instability." That's like saying the MX

missile will solve the problems of the South Bronx.

Speaking of the MX, it's to be built at a cost of \$108 billion—\$1,200 for every U.S. taxpayer. This and other nuclear weapon programs are being pushed even though we can now destroy every major Russian city 44 times.

All in all, the plan is to spend \$1.5 trillion on the military during the next five years. (That would be a million a day for 2,740 years.)

A chunk of that money is to fund the new Rapid Deployment Force (RDF) to be available for military intervention around the world—perhaps in places like El Salvador.

The AFSCME International Executive Board has called for nonintervention in that country. A now infamous State Department White Paper claiming the Russians were behind the unrest there has been largely discredited. It sounds like Viet Nam again.

The price for now of all of this military expansion is the dismantling of the system of social services and programs that working people fought long and hard to win. The ultimate cost may be even higher.

Kirkland Warns Social Cuts Threaten Support for Defense

Chicago—Vital popular support for defense spending could be weakened by slashes in social programs, AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland asserted in a speech before the national convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles here.

The AFL-CIO has been a "consistent and steadfast" supporter of strong defense policies "as a requirement for survival in a dangerous world," Kirkland said. He stressed that in a democracy cuts in needed social programs such as social security, jobs programs and aid to cities, coupled with tax cuts for the rich, can undermine public support necessary to maintain high levels of military spending.

"It makes no sense," Kirkland told the

delegates, "for an Administration dedicated to repairing America's standing in the world to create new anti-defense constituencies among the elderly, the jobless, the working poor, the minorities, the sick and the disabled."

All Americans must feel that they have a stake in the survival of our society, Kirkland said, pointing out that such feelings of anticipation have been "enhanced by federal programs that have cushioned our economy against unemployment, created jobs, eased poverty, attacked discrimination, trained the unskilled, taught the young and helped the needy."

Referring to Administration statements that Americans are entitled to nothing from the federal government, Kirkland pointed out that the Constitution requires the federal government to "provide for the common defense and the general welfare."

"**THE AMERICAN** people are entitled to both," Kirkland emphasized. "They are not required to choose one or the other. That is the mandate of the Constitution. It supersedes any other mandate, real or imagined, which the Administration labors to extract from last November."

Kirkland was given the fraternal order's Murray-Green Award, named after the late CIO President Philip Murray and the late AFL President William Green who had both been active in the organization. The award was established to recognize the long-term relationship between the organization and the labor movement.

Kirkland praised the Eagles for their efforts since their founding in support of programs that aid workers and their families, including workers' compensation, health care and social security.

International Union and of each other," says a beaming Council 57 Business Agent Prudence Slaathaug.

"The city council had the correct perception that they weren't only facing us, but AFSCME's million members as well," adds Slaathaug.

The \$1.4 million in pay equity adjustments will mean—notes Local 101 MEF Vice Pres. Nancy Clifford—additional raises averaging better than 9.6% over two years for workers in



Well-planned rallies reflected the organization and determination of San Jose's AFSCME members.

signed up with AFSCME in the course of this three-year struggle."

The struggle isn't over yet, adds MEF Vice Pres. Clifford, whose recreation department job was shown to be undervalued by \$12,000. She notes that the historic gains still fall short of complete pay equity.

"We did quite well, given the economic situation out here, but it's just the beginning," sums up Clifford. "We won't rest until we've won full pay equity for all of our people."

Landmark Pact Caps Three-Year Struggle

The eight-day strike that brought the national news media pouring into this rapidly growing West Coast city was but the most recent act in a long drama.

It was early in 1979—after months of preliminary work—that some 225 Local 101 Municipal Employees Federation (MEF) clericals staged a "sick-out" to press the city to fund a \$65,000 job evaluation study.

Crucial to the success of the struggle was the winning of a joint labor-management job evaluation committee and the agreement not to consider as a factor what workers in traditionally underpaid jobs earn from other employers.

"That was crucial," explains Council 57 Business Agent Bill Callahan. "If we hadn't banned consideration of this 'comparable marketability'

factor, the study would have helped perpetuate wage discrimination."

In July, 1981 the Local 101 chapter won agreement from the city to bargain over the results of the study. The results—which proved that traditionally female jobs were paid some 15% less than traditionally male jobs of comparable worth—came out in December, just weeks before a new city council was to take office in January.

Once again, unified and determined action ensured that bargaining began before the old city council left office. It did, two days before Christmas.

The union's militancy continued, with such efforts as a mass rally on National Secretaries Day this past April and many other actions.

AFSCME Research Director Linda Lampkin

also testified before the city council, proving that San Jose could afford to fund pay equity.

As the July 5 strike deadline approached, the city sought to make city workers fund the pay equity raises themselves—by offering minimal general raises. But the union held firm.

And when the city council backed off from a tentative agreement on July 12, 40 activists took over their meeting. Within an hour they were joined at City Hall by 200 other strikers, many of whom then marched with lit candles to the mayor's home.

Almost a year ago, San Jose's confidential employees' unit president Rosemary Strucss looked ahead, noting, "We could make history."

She and her union brothers and sisters in San Jose have done just that.

We Must Get Ready to Take On Foes Within as Well as Without

by Jackie Presser
International
Vice-President

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA—The IBT will convene here the week of June 1 for the purpose of electing a General President and Executive Board. This will be the 22nd International Convention, representing 78 years of history for the benefit of mankind.

All of us, Teamster representatives from the highest level to the Conferences, Joint Councils and Local Unions, officers, business agents, stewards and rank-and-file members, can be proud of the overall accomplishments that have contributed so significantly to the standard of living for the working men and women of our nation.

The Teamsters were there from the horse and buggy to the gasoline age to the electrical age—we were there with the start of the auto industry and the birth of the air age. We were there for the birth of the atomic and hydrogen age and we are still there going through the birth of the space age.

The Teamsters stood fast through the First World War, the Great Depression and the Second World War.

There is no segment of our nation's history in this century in which you as Teamsters have not played a major role as spokesmen for organized labor. The history of this nation parallels the history of the IBT. Teamsters from all corners of America were weaned on fighting for what they believed in.

Teamster officers and organizers from the beginning have had to take to the streets and alleys to fight for workers' rights, decent working conditions and benefits for members

and families. As our nation changed, so changed the structure and membership of the IBT. When we went from horse and wagon, we went to the gas age to represent those who left one era to go to the next . . . we have been there time and time again.

Teamsters and their leaders have stood strong and united against the tyranny of Nazism and Communism. Teamsters have always been and will continue to be the leaders for a democratic free nation. We have always been the advocates of free enterprise, as well as the innovators of better workers' representation. Teamster gains from 40¢/hour to \$12/hour, from 60 hour work weeks to 40 hour work weeks, from no benefits to total benefits, from a handful of working Americans to over 2 million working Americans . . . that is the history of the Teamsters.

Government administrations



have mounted attack after-attack on the Teamsters. Persecution now prolonged over 25 years has not penetrated and will not penetrate the fortress of this great International Union.

As we gather in Las Vegas, we pay homage to those Teamsters who made our history and because of God Almighty's call, are no longer with us. We humbly acknowledge those departed leaders who have created what we all represent today—2 million working Americans and their families.

All of us, every single Teamster, must join together as never before to be prepared to fight for what we have believed in from the very founding of the IBT seventy-eight years ago.

The serpent coils of our ongoing enemies are once again rising to attack. The venom started over these past 5 years will start to spread as never before, attacking our leadership and our very foundations. These are those amongst us today who do not advocate the Teamster philosophy of unionism. They preach unionism, but practice Communism and Socialism. They disguise themselves as Brothers and Sisters, while in truth they are enemies dedicated to Totally Destroy our Union and all free unions.

We have been victorious over our enemies for the past 78 years. We have beheaded the serpent time and time again, and we Teamsters will not be caught sleeping when the serpent is once again at large.

We no longer can tolerate the baseless, unjustified attacks from Communist Socialist or-

chesterated media, newspapers, TV or radio—organized by captive political spokesmen who are and have been the advocates of "Get the Teamsters."

Millions upon millions of the taxpayers' dollars have been wasted on anti-Teamster witch hunts for the purpose of seeing the attackers' names in print or their pictures on the evening news.

The attacks on the Teamsters by our enemies are attacks on you, the members, and your families . . . the members that we speak for. We no longer can afford to let the leadership of our International Union be attacked time and time again, without a total response from all Teamsters. Our voices must be heard and our votes will have to be counted from every county and state across the U.S.

We must organize ourselves as never before to stop once and for all the disgracing of this great American institution, the IBT.

We must confront our enemies in the Congress and the news media, and most of all we must expose the real serpent, the concealed agents of Communism and Socialism.

We must cleanse our union once and for all of cell blocks of organized, anti-American union dissidents. We started out in the streets, and if that is where we must start from once again—the advantage is ours. We didn't have an international structure speaking for 2 million working Americans then . . . we didn't have five Conferences and 44 Joint Councils and qualified/elected representatives from every district in this country to speak and to stand shoulder to shoulder for this great cause.

We do have all of this now and more coming. Let's use it for the preservation of this American institution, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

President Reagan's goal is a new beginning for America . . . we Teamsters ask the President for a new beginning for the Teamsters.



Ronald Reagan addressing the annual meeting of the Ohio Conference of Teamsters.