

# no separate peace

A news-magazine for construction workers.

June, 1976 VOL. 2 No. 2

The ability of striking construction workers to effectively picket worksites has been restricted since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947. A union picketing against a particular employer, with the intent or effect of keeping workers of other contractors or sub-contractors off the construction site, constitutes an illegal secondary boycott under Taft-Hartley.

This ruling was upheld by a 1951 Supreme Court decision prohibiting these kinds of pickets.

For over twenty-five years, Labor has attempted to defeat the "secondary boycott ruling". Some argue that contractors and sub-contractors working on the same project are "joint venturers" having common interests, and that picketing against joint venturers was not a secondary boycott.

This fight of building trade workers, to obtain the same bargaining tools allowed to unionized industrial workers of a single employer, was recently used to cover up an "attempted robbery" of workers' rights. The robbers were from our own ranks - the Labor leaders of today.

## Common-Site Picketing Bill

The "Common-Site Picketing Bill" (HR 5900) will undoubtedly go down in history as the most lobbied for and emotional Bill in the past 94th Congress.

In the construction industry, the Common Site Picketing Bill would have made secondary boycotts legal, thus allowing construction trade unions to picket a construction job site even if it meant keeping other workers off the job — including those employed by another contractor.

However, one of the provisions of the Common Site Picketing Bill required a union wishing to engage in common site picketing, to give 10 days notice in writing to all unions on the site, to the general contractor, to the parent labor organization (the International), and to a Federal Collective Bargaining Committee. It also stipulated that common site picketing is legal, only if the International Union authorizes the action, taking control another step away from the local rank-and-file.

No wonder, the Internationals spent so much time and money (our dues' money) trying to get Congress to pass the Bill. And these leaders had most of us fooled too - including our local leaders.

Quoting Andrew J. Biemiller, leading lobbyist for the AFL-CIO, as stating that the purpose of the Bill was "to see that every job in America is a union job".

When was the last time our unions tried to organize the unorganized? We know that the real reasons behind the Common Site Picketing Bill was to rob us of our local autonomy. The International tries to steal from us, not just money, but more and more control of our local situations.

And the International labor leaders want "every job to be a union job", except they don't care about what wages and conditions the workers have (see "Pan Am Comes to Trident," page 4).

## Curses...Foiled Again

Believe it or not, President Ford did workers a favor when he vetoed the "Common Site Picketing Bill" on January 7, 1976. Although Ford's veto halted the plans of the national labor bureaucrats to acquire more control, he did not intend to protect our local autonomy either.

President Ford, along with the employers and our sell-out leadership, was looking for another bill that would revamp the entire collective bargaining process in the construction industry. The President indicated that he would sign the Common Site Picketing Bill only if both Bills reached his desk at approximately the same time.

The Bill, called the "Collective Bargaining Bill of 1975" was an attempt to give national unions and national contractors and builder associations more control over their local chapters during negotiations.



## COMMON SITE PICKETING

# Local Control of the Right To Strike

"We are practical men", said Robert A. Georgine, president of the AFL-CIO's Building and Construction Trades Department, who endorsed the Bill. "We think that whatever the negative effect of this (Collective Bargaining) Bill, it is far out-weighted by the establishment of an orderly procedure for bargaining."

The "orderly procedure" that Georgine is talking about means a surrender of local union autonomy and rank and file control to a sellout national leadership.

Both the Common Site Picketing Bill and the Collective Bargaining Bill have been "killed" by Ford's veto. The right of workers to effectively picket construction sites, should not be gained at the expense of our right to democratically control our union's affairs.

However, we need and must fight for the right of Common site picketing, but the control must be in the hands of the workers involved locally. This right should be fought for in all contract negotiations, instead of waiting for legislation (see Plumbers Fight for Right to Strike, page 8).

In the future, we should examine every issue affecting our work and rights, especially those issues the current leadership tries to sell us. We should examine the democratic character of our unions and Internationals to guarantee that our future national labor leaders respect and fight for the interests of workers, and not for "peace with management".

### Inside You Will Find:

<i>Taft-Hartley: the Slave Labor Bill</i>	p.3
<i>Racism the Divider</i>	p.2
<i>Pan Am Comes to Trident</i>	p.4
<i>The Invisible Picket</i>	p.5
<i>Workers Victorious In Angola</i>	p.6
<i>How to Improve Your Pensions</i>	p.7
<i>Plumbers Fight For Right to Strike</i>	p.8











