

"A Strike Against One Housewife Is A Strike Against All"

Los Angeles County Council of Women

Public Information Bureau
Retail Food Industry
Los Angeles 17, Calif.

December 22, 1958

Gentlemen:

We, the members of the Los Angeles County Council of Women, are convinced that the wage demands of the Retail Clerks Union are excessive and unreasonable and would ultimately result in higher food prices. We are also convinced that a strike against the retail markets to invoke these excessive demands is a strike against the community. All such strikes can accomplish at best is an immense hardship on millions of people, including little children, and higher prices to housewives, if the unions win.

We firmly believe the moral responsibility for this situation rests on the Retail Clerks Union as the striking party. The unions cannot hide behind accusations of lockouts against employees or pretensions of striking only against Los Angeles stores.

Regardless of what we read in the daily papers, we know there are thousands in this city without work and on the welfare rolls. We, the taxpayers, pay the bill. The Los Angeles County Council of Women believe this strike against one group of housewives to enforce demands against all housewives is, in our opinion, a strike against all of us.

Trusting that you will give this your kind consideration, we are

Respectfully,

Mrs. Paxton Lytle
(Mrs.) Paxton Lytle,* Vice-Pres. and
Public Relations Chairman,
Los Angeles County Council of Women

*Mrs. Lytle is Past President of the Los Angeles County Federation of Women's Clubs. She led the fight for safety of the California State Federation of Women's Clubs for eight years as chairman of its Safety Committee and served eight years as Chairman of its Narcotics Committee. She is a prominent member of the Democratic Party.

Reproduced on this page is a letter from an organized group of Southern California women that deals with a threat as serious to the people of Southern California as an enemy attack — the threat of a strike against the public's food supply.

The letter speaks for itself.

The Retail Clerks Union is threatening to strike over the employers' refusal to accept a wage and added fringe benefit package that amounts to over 80 cents an hour, or a \$1,600 raise for each and every one of the 36,000 union members.

The easy way out for the markets would be to yield to these union demands and simply pass the bill on to the consumer in higher food costs. They are opposing the demands, however, because they are interested in keeping food prices down and because they feel such demands are fundamentally wrong and excessive.

The announced strategy of the union is to strike and close only a few of the markets in the Los Angeles area, leaving the rest of the market owners with no alternative except to yield eventually or to defend themselves on the policy that a strike against one market is a strike against them all.

The Los Angeles County Council of Women consists of some 400 business and professional women who were formerly affiliated with the Federation of Women's Clubs.

These women have no axe to grind. Their sole interest is to see the community protected in a grave situation that is bound to lead to higher prices for food and hardship for millions of families.

The Los Angeles County Council of Women is not deceived.

They see through the union managers' purpose: to divide and conquer the market owners so that in the end their selfish demands are met and all markets, one by one, are forced to accept the union's terms.

They have heard union managers boast that they speak for all the food clerks of Southern California. They know that wages of the food clerks, already the highest in the country, are the same from San Luis Obispo to Santa Ana, and that a wage increase of \$1,600 per clerk in Los Angeles will also apply equally to clerks in Riverside, San Fernando Valley or San Bernardino. And, they also know that housewives in every city of Southern California and every community in-between eventually will have to pay the price of higher wages for the clerks in higher food costs for their families.

No matter how the unions conceal their aims behind other issues, there is only one, fundamentally, in which they have a real interest—the package increase of eighty cents an hour for each and every clerk—\$1,800 in added wages and benefits for each and every one of the 36,000 clerks in Southern California—enough to feed an average family a year and a half—at the expense of the retail food industry and, ultimately, the housewife.

That, simply, is the union strategy in the boldest wage grab in the history of a union that has already increased its wages by 310 per cent in the past 10 years.

RETAIL FOOD STORES OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

(The above advertisement is presented as a Public Service by The Public Information Bureau of Southern California Retail Food Stores giving employment to more than 85 per cent of all members of the Retail Clerks Union)