PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

UFW Names Members To State Wage Board

Five Farm Worker Movement staff and supporters will sit on the state government board that will help establish the minimum wage, maximum hours and working conditions for farm workers in California.

The state Industrial Welfare Commission (IWC) notified the five men and women nominated by the union that they will sit as the wage board. Wage Board No. 14, the board considering hours, working conditions and standards for agricultural occupations in the fields. One of the five UFW nominees will also sit as an employee representative on Wage Board No. 13, the board dealing with wages and conditions for workers in agricultural packing sheds.

The wage board members have a great responsibility. They make recommendations to the Industrial Welfare Commission on a minimum wage, maximum hours, and working conditions for all workers in the state. By regulating maximum hours they determine hours beyond which overtime pay will be required. If the IWC accepts the wage boards recommendations, they become the law of the State of California.

The IWC is part of the state Department of Industrial Relations, which has as one of its aims the promotion and welfare of California wage earners, including farm workers. The Department is committed to improving working conditions and advancing employment opportunities for workers.

The wage boards are composed of equal numbers of representatives from labor and management. The chairman represents the public at large and is not selected from either labor or management. He or she acts as a moderator during the discussions. The chairman has a vote and may express his or her point of view.

While serving on the wage board, members are considered employees of the state and take an Oath of Allegiance.

After the IWC receives reports from the wage boards, it prepares proposed regulations for industries and occupations and then holds public hearings on the proposed orders. Following the public hearings, the commission fixes minimum wages for all workers, maximum hours and working conditions.

Appointed to IWC Wage Board No. 14 for field occupations were my assistant, Brother Marc Grossman; Brother David Martinez, an instructor at the Martin Luther King Jr. Collective Bargaining School; Sister Esther Munday from the UFW's Delano Field Office; Father William J. O'Donnell, pastor of St. Joseph the Workman Church in Berkeley and a longtime close friend of the Union; and Sister Esther Padilla, a longtime veteran organizer and union staff member. Also on this board is Brother J.J. Rodriguez, President of the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO and longtime UFW ally.

In addition, Brother Grossman was named to Wage Board No. 13, for workers who are employed in agricultural packing sheds. Sister Padilla was appointed as an alternate to this board.

Representing the growers on the wage board for field jobs are Irma S. Castanedo of Corona Growers, Inc; Labor Association in Upland; William V. Lloyd of Coastal Growers in Oxford; David Ninomiya of Ninomiya Nursery Company in Richmond; Don Rosendal of the Fresno County Farm Bureau; Michael E. Rue from the California Cattlemen's Association in Marysville; and Gerald D. Smith of Pacific Agricope in Blythe.

The chairman of Wage Board No. 14 is Gary S. Caviglia, assistant professor in the Agricultural Management Department at California Polytechnic University in San Luis Obispo.

Wage Board No. 14 will meet on February 6 and 7 in Los Angeles.

Other employee representatives on Wage Board No. 13, for agricultural packing sheds come from the AFL-CIO Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Workers in El Centro and Salinas, Packinghouse Workers Union Local 161 from Fresno and Asg Pilipino, the Filipino community group in Stockton headed by Brother Andy Imaian, a former UFW officer, who will sit on the wage board.

Wage Board No. 13 will meet from January 31 to February 1 in Fresno.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Perry's Plants - Fremont

A grievance was settled last month when Perry's Plants agreed to reinstate Brother Raul Jimenez with full seniority rights.

On June 14, Brother Jimenez became ill at work and advised his supervisor that he had to leave. Five days later he was discharged without prior notification to either the Union or the grievant. No one was aware of the discharge until June 20, when a friend of Brother Jimenez, Brother Juan Samaniego, went to the company to talk to the production manager to let him know that Brother Jimenez was still sick. The production manager told him that Brother Jimenez didn't have to come in to work because he'd been fired.

The company fired Brother Jimenez because they claimed that he violated a company rule by not notifying the company of his whereabouts for more than three days. We charged the company with not following the correct procedure prior to the discharge, as no written notice or union representative was notified that Brother Jimenez was being discharged. The company had clearly violated Article 6 of our contract by firing Brother Jimenez without due process or just cause. The Union did not receive a written notice from the company within 48 hours of the discharge and Brother Jimenez did not receive notice of his discharge until four days after the company had fired him.

When the grievance was referred to arbitration, the company decided to reinstate Brother Jimenez without further proceedings.

Members of the ranch committee at Perry's Plants are Brothers Tony Lopez, president, Raul Ramirez, vice president, Sister Maria Soria, secretary, and Brothers Darrell Kooi and Ernie Alejandro, committee members.

Admira111: Packing - Salinas

A grievance was recently settled at an arbitration hearing when Admiral Packing Company in Salinas agreed to reimburse four workers at the ranch for two days of lost wages.

The grievance involved four lettuce closers. These workers, Brothers Samuel Sanchez, Trino Sanchez, Javier Sanchez, and Armando Sanchez, were suspended from their jobs for four days for alleged improper stapling of lettuce boxes. The workers charged that the company had changed the requirements for stapling boxes and did not negotiate with the Union concerning the change.

In addition to reimbursing the workers for two days of lost work, the company also agreed to recognize the right of the Union to file on the merits under the contract article, New or Changed Operations, due to the nature of the stapling change instituted by the company.
Assisting the workers on this grievance were Brother Oscar Mon- 
dragon and the Arbitration Division of the UFW.

Admiral is a large lettuce ranch in 
Salinas, employing close to 150 
workers at peak season.

Yuma Convictions Appealed
UFW Attorney Jim Rutkowski 
reports that the June 23 convictions 
of my wife, Helen and myself for 
violating Judge Helm's anti-picketing 
injunction have been appealed to the 
Arizona state Court of Appeals.

Brother Rutkowski filed a brief on 
October 18 to appeal the convictions 
from the Yuma County Superior 
Court. Helen and I were arrested on 
June 13 for deliberately violating an 
injunction which banned all picketing 
by all persons at all locations on or near 
G and S Produce Company fields. Be-
cause we violated an illegal injunction, 
we were jailed overnight in Yuma (see 
Newsletter, June 26, 1978 and 

RFJUANA MEDICAL PLAN
Tijuana Project Opens
On October 23 we started a medical 
Project in Tijuana to serve UFW 
members across the border. Under the 
direction of Sister Gloria Soto, the Ti-
juana Project is now ready to begin to 
provide medical services to our 
members who live in Tijuana.

Patterned after the RFJ Mexicali 
Project, a pilot program which opened in 
May, 1977 to provide services to our 
members in Mexicali, the main leader-
ship of the Tijuana Project comes from 
workers serving on the Medical Ser-
vice Committee (Comité de Servicios 
Médicos). Among other respons-
bilities, the workers on the Committee 
interviewed and evaluated doctors who 
will service union members and set up 
hospital, pharmacy and other services 
for the people who would be cared for 
by the project. The four members of 
the Committee are Brothers Manuel 
Tec (Chula Vista Farms), president of 
the Medical Services Committee, Luis 
Gomez (William Mendoza), secretary, 
and Committee members Salvador 
Estrada (Skyline), and Martin Cobar-
rubias (TMY).

As Committee members interviewed 
and evaluated doctors, they kept in 
mind the Project's goal of finding doc-
tors who would give the best possible 
care to our members. Out of the initial 
54 doctors who were interviewed and 
evaluated by the Committee members 
and Sister Soto, three were chosen as 
full time doctors to serve with the Pro-
ject—Dr. Jose Jesus Mapula, Dr. 
Rogelio Angulo Valenzuela, and Chief 
Medical Consultant, Dr. Francisco 
Rueda Fernández, who will also super-
vice the other doctors. These doctors 
are assigned to the families covered by 
the Project.

The Project has also contracted the 
services of a pharmacy, radiologist and 
as hospital to serve the needs of our 
members with top quality medical aid. 
The hospital, La Clinica Hospital 
Moderno, is run by Dr. Armando Fer-
nández de Leon, and is open to serve 
our members should they require 
hospital care.

Like the Project in Mexicali, the Ti-
juana Project has set up a Concilio which 
consists of a member from each 
Ranch Committee in the area—Sister Dolores Barragan (Egger and Ohio), and Brothers Nicholas Cruz, (Chula 
Vista Farms), Angel S. Mendez (Cozza Farms), Carlos M. Ordonez (Encinias 
Floral), Luis Gomez (William Mendo-
za), Jorge Garcia (Robert Hall, Inc.), Euciebio Carretero (Piper), 
Ramon Diaz (SKF), Salvador Estrada 
(Skyline), Gustavo Espinoza (TMY), 
Francisco Rubio (Sam Vener) and 
Jesus Gonzales (Koichi Yamamoto). 
The main job of the Concilio is to 
educate the workers about the Project 
and deal with any questions or pro-
blems that may arise.

The staff of the Tijuana Project, 
who will deal with the paper work and 
make sure the Project runs efficiently 
are Sisters Gloria Soto, director, 
Ernestina Loustauanu, and Maria 
Zavala.

LABOR
Coors Company Pays Workers 
$250,000 in Settlement Case
On October 5, Brewery Workers 
Local 366 and the Adolph Coors 
Brewery reached a long delayed settle-
ment on an arbitration award which 
the Coors Company had previously 
refused to comply with.

The arbitration concerned the dema-
ion of 111 workers in the bargaining 
unit from the top three job classifica-
tions negotiated in the contract. An ar-
brator ordered the company to reinstate these 111 employees back into 
their former classification and reim-
burse them for wages that they lost. 
The settlement that was reached 
covered lost wages which totaled 
$250,000.

The case began on February 23, 
1976. It was at this time that Coors, 
without consulting the union, began its 
plan to weaken and undermine Local 
366. The company's plan was to 
eliminate all previously bargained for 
supervisory duties for 111 workers, a 
direct violation of an existing contract 
between the company and the union. 
A grievance was filed by the union on 
February 25, 1976, protesting the 
removal of work from the bargaining 
unit. On March 10, 1977, an arbitrator 
upheld the union position. Coors was 
then ordered to reinstate the 111 
employees to their former jobs without 
loss of seniority and with complete 
back pay for all lost wages. Coors stub-
bornly refused to comply with the ar-
brator's decision.

Local 366 was forced to take that 
decision into Federal Court to enforce 
it. Court proceedings were again 
delayed by Coors' refusal to voluntarily 
turn over to the Court the records 
needed for a decision to be made. It 
was at this time that Coors made 
another attempt to destroy Local 366 
by petitioning the National Labor 
Relations Board for a decertification 
election.

The National Labor Relations 
Board, however, ruled that no election 
would be permitted until such a time as 
the arbitration and enforcement pro-
cedures were brought to a conclusion. 
Faced with a possible court order to 
comply, the company was left with lit-
tle choice except working out a settle-
ment with the union. Several more 
weeks of heated meetings between both 
partiess finally brought the case to a 
satisfactory conclusion.

This settlement does not, however, 
end the strike or boycott of Coors beer 
which was called 18 months ago by 
the Brewery Workers Local 366.