



EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

MAR 20 1968

REC'D MAR 21 1968

File w/ P.C.

Senator Walter Mondale
443 Old Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Mondale:

Thank you for your correspondence of March 6, 1968
enclosing a letter dated February 9, 1968, from Mrs. Rosemary
Sokolowski.

Mrs. Sokolowski was notified of her right to file suit
on February 8, 1968, the day prior to her letter to you.

We feel that this has resolved the matter of her concern
and thank you for this opportunity to be of service.

Sincerely,

Warren C. C. C.

Warren C. C. C.
Warren C. C. C., Director
Legislative Affairs

File w/ P.C.

[Handwritten initials]

REC'D FEB 8 1968

February 6, 1968
234 6th Avenue North
South St. Paul, Minnesota 55075

Senator Walter Mondale
443 Old Senate Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Mondale:

Enclosed is a copy of my letter of February 3, 1968 directed to Mr. Frank C. Kent, Commissioner, Department of Human Rights, St. Paul, Minnesota. I am also enclosing a copy of of the newspaper article referred to in my letter.

I trust the problems referred to in these two enclosures will present you with something constructive for consideration for any further legislation on Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or any legislation at State levels.

We women are involved in a very complex entanglement..

Your consideration of our problems will be greatly appreciated..

Yours truly,

Rosemary Sokolowski
(Mrs.) Rosemary Sokolowski

enc: 2

P.S.

*The newspaper article referred to,
was sent to your office the week
of January 28th.*

February 3, 1968
234 6th Avenue North
South St. Paul, Minnesota 55075

Mr. Frank C. Kent, Commissioner
Department of Human Rights
State of Minnesota
Room 55, State Office Building

Dear Mr. Kent:

I am enclosing a copy of an article by Mr. Mark Wyman on Women Job Bias which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune of January 28, 1968.

I was much appalled with the comment in the article which was credited to Mrs. Fred Stone, a consultant from your department.

I find it difficult to believe that there should be so little concern as expressed by Mrs. Stone, when there are some 200 female plant employees at Swift & Company who are victims of unfair employment practices. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Washington, D. C. has been handling a case for a group of these women for nearly two years now.

I might advise Mrs. Stone to check with Mrs. Viola Kanatz of your staff who has many of the details of our case with Swift & Company and our Union. I have contacted Mrs. Kanatz numerous times regarding our problems and have found her to be most cooperative. She has even been so kind as to take time out of her evenings to attend meetings with our Union membership and Officials.

Mrs. Stone might also find it helpful to check with Edna Schwartz and Mary Lou Hill who were at one time on the Governor's Commission of Women Status during the Rolvaag administration. These women are also familiar with our case.

To further enlighten our State Advisory Commission on Women Affairs, be advised that on April 6, 1966, we women contacted Governor Rolvaag's office and informed Mrs. Mary Lou Hill of our problems and requested an appointment with the Governor. Although Governor Rolvaag was ill with the flu and was limiting his visitors for the day, he graciously granted us the time for a personal meeting with him that day. He was very shocked to learn that women of our State of Minnesota were undergoing such treatment and that our Union was unable to do anything for us. Realizing that the State had no tools with which to handle our case, Governor Rolvaag nevertheless felt we should not be ignored. He arranged a meeting for us for that very afternoon with Mr. Walter Warfield, who was then Assistant Director of the State Commission Against Discrimination.

cont.2

Upon getting the details of our case, Mr. Warfield indicated a concern for our case and on our behalf, he sent a letter to Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., who was then the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Then, ofcourse, Election came. Changes were made in our State Agencies. At the same time in Washington, D.C., the very new Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was undergoing many changes of it's Directors, Assistant Directors, Chairmen etc., along with possible revamping of procedure and any number of other obstacles which no doubt did little to accelerate the progress of our case.

Should Mrs. Stone care to make a further check, she will find that on November 21, 1967, I contacted the office of Governor Levander to discuss the Decision of September 26, 1967 which was reached by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Since the Governor was too busy to meet with us at that time, a meeting was set up with Mr. Hoaglund, Assistant to the Governor. We met with Mr. Hoaglund on November 29, 1967 at which time we informed him briefly of our problems and also informed him as to the progress of our case with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Mr. Hoaglund asked that I leave him a copy of my letter of March 29 1966, in which I first filed our Complaint with the Commission. A copy of said letter was left with Mr. Hoaglund.

I'm sure, Mr. Kent, this letter plainly indicates that we women are not without our problems in employment. I'm also sure that should Mrs. Stone care to explore our problems created by automation, discrimination, unfair employment practices, etc., she will undoubtedly find there is much to be done on the part of Labor, Management and Government to create better job security and protection for us women.

Since our Governor is pressing for private industry to hire our youth, let us go a step further and provide the protection and job security for them, so that they, after some 20 years or so of service to an employer, will not be faced with the type of problems we women find ourselves faced with today. Many of us female plant employes at Swift and Company, were hired as youths of 16 and 17 years of age back in the 1930's and 40's.

I trust my comments have been taken constructively and that you will give them some consideration.

Any cooperation extended us will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

(Mrs.) Rosemary Sokolowski

enc.

cc:

Vice-Pres. Hubert Humphrey
Willard Wirtz-Sec. Labor
Governor Harold Levander
Senator Eugene Mc Carthy
Senator Walter Mondale
Rep. Albert Quie
Rep. Ancher Nelson
Rep. Joseph Karth
Rep. John Blatnik

Rep. Martha Griffith (D. Mich.)
George Meaney-Pres. AFL-CIO
Walter Reuther-United Auto Workers
Ralph Helstein-Pres. UPWA
David Roe-State Pres. AFL-CIO
Viola Kanatz-State Dept. Hum. Rights
Mrs. B. Flynn-Pres. So. St. Paul
BPWA
Pres. League of Women Voters

January 28, 1968
234 6th Avenue North
South St. Paul, Minnesota 55075

REC'D FEB - 1 1968

9
Fredrick B. Sweet, Editor
The Union Advocate, Inc.
440 Minnehaha Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55103

Dear Mr. Sweet:

I am enclosing an article from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune dated January 28, 1968 regarding women and job bias.

The problem to which the article refers to is a very real and serious one. It is indeed unfortunate that our Union Brotherhood has not seen fit to give us women the necessary assistance needed during these many years of unfair labor practices with Swift and Company. I say this in light of the fact that we women had to, as the last resort, turn to the Federal Government for job protection that should have been provided by our Union.

I trust that you will see fit to give our problem some honest research and exposure through your media. I am certain that the unfair practices that we women have been subjected to, is not only a local problem. Similar problems have been found to exist with women from other Meat Packing Plants in various parts of the country.

We women feel that the indifference displayed in our case by the top level of our International and at our Local Union level is in-excusable and should be brought to light and that a sincere and honest effort be made to do away with the unfair labor practices imposed on us women by Management and/tolerated by our Union. We women are also a very big part of this Civil Rights movement and do not wish to be lost in the shuffle. In order to avoid a lot of future complications, a sincere and fair effort should be expended toward some constructive action in behalf of the problems facing the women today. If such an approach is not now taken, what will be the conditions facing the wives, sisters, daughters, etc. oftomorrow? The working woman is here to stay and let us not be apathetic concerning their problems. The injustices tolerated along these lines today can only breed greater problems for the future generations.

Any help you can give us women will be greatly appreciated. Should you wish any further information, feel free to contact me.

Yours truly,

Rosemary Sokolowski

Mrs. Rosemary Sokolowski

enc.

cc: Senator E. McCarthy
Senator W. Mondale
George Burton - F.B.I.

Are Women Still Victims of Job Bias?

By MARK WYMAN

Minneapolis Tribune Staff Writer

The packinghouses of South St. Paul sprawl along the riverfront, confronting the hillside community above like actors facing an audience.

To these stockyards and meat packing plants some 5,000 workers come daily, passing lines of waiting cattle trucks. Most of the employees belong to the United Packinghouse, Food and Allied Workers Union.

EIGHTEEN women have challenged both of these forces. After two years, they finally have won preliminary support from a federal agency.

Their charge: They have lost good jobs at the Swift & Co. plant because they are women, and potential jobs have been combined with men's work to reduce their employment.

They also contend that their union has not helped them.

"I started in the plant when I was 17 years old," recalled Mrs. Rosemary Sokolowski, one of the group's leaders, in discussing events since some 50 women were laid off at Swift in late 1965. A 19-year veteran with Swift, she added:



Mrs. Sokolowski

"All I know is packinghouse . . ."

THE DRIVING force carrying the women through two years of meetings, letter-writing, and arguments with union and company officials is their belief that the reward for years of union and company service should not be layoffs and sporadic employment.

Support for them has come from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) in Washington, D.C.

The EEOC said on Oct. 18, 1967, that it "has found reasonable cause to believe that an unlawful employment practice within the meaning of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has been committed."

BOTH Swift and the union have sought reconsideration of the preliminary finding.

While the legal entanglement is worked out, at various Swift jobs the women wait — working, fearing layoff, watching others drift away from packinghouse employment.



Miss Birch

"Why does automation always take our jobs — never a man's job?" asked Lucille Birch, a 20-year Swift veteran.

Her statement would find a quick reply, however, from the hundreds of men who have seen their jobs vanish at Swift in recent years. For the South St. Paul sex discrimination cases are only part of a labyrinth where, the observer soon learns, the choices are not always between right and wrong.

THE DISPUTE is a true child of postwar America, a nation irreversibly involved in the onrushing technology of the second industrial revolution—automation.

Three major factors have come together in the Swift case:

1 Women are joining the American labor force in larger numbers, taking on new importance in many fields. From 1954 to 1964, for example, employment of women in the nation increased 35 per cent while male employment rose 8 per cent.

In Minnesota, women now make up one-third of all nonfarm wage and salary employment — more than 400,000 of the 1.2 million workers.

2 Automation is increasing rapidly in many industries, especially in meat-packing. In 1957, one meat-packing employee could process 45 pounds of meat per hour; now he can process almost 78 pounds.

One result: The production force at the Swift plant in South St. Paul has dropped from 3,300 in 1957 to 1,850 workers today. Nationally, Swift's employment declined 16,000 in 10 years (to 48,300) while the firm's net earnings went up \$16.7 million.

Automation inevitably raises the importance of the flexible worker and the skilled worker—and favoring men over women. In meat packing, it means that the employee is most prized who can fit in with the differing job demands as workloads shift with changes in the meat supply or consumer buying habits.

3 New laws are attempting to ease the dislocations of this revolution, and are predictably causing new problems as well. In 1963 came the federal equal pay for equal work law for women; the Civil Rights Act of 1964 followed, with its provisions in Title VII barring job discrimination by race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. This created the EEOC.

WHILE past racial troubles left a legacy of court precedents covering minority group employment, the sex discrimination measure was born into a different legal environment. A California attorney, Robert S. Miller Jr., concluded in a Minnesota Law Review article that:

"There is ambiguous

Packinghouse

Continued on Page Four

PACKINGHOUSE: Dispute Told

Continued From Page One

language in the test of the statute and a dearth of meaningful legislative history."

To The New Republic, the sex statute is "a mischievous joke" by congressional opponents of civil rights. The magazine told of the stories making the rounds about the "bunny" problem: "If a male applies for the job, does Title VII . . . require a Playboy Club to hire him as a 'bunny'?"

The problems of job discrimination against women are not funny for many people, however.

ONE MINNESOTA official believes there is a trouble caused by confining women to certain "traditional" fields such as phone operators.

Mrs. Viola May Kanatz, deputy commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Human Rights, argued that "school boards all over the state continue to have discriminatory hiring patterns"—and get away with it because there is no state law banning job discrimination by sex, and because the federal act exempts schools.

Some problems in women's employment in Minnesota, Mrs. Kanatz continued, are similar to those which Negroes often face: They can get promotions within an all-woman department, "but then you're in a dead end."

ANOTHER Minnesotan takes an opposing view, however. Mrs. Fred Stone, consultant for the new state advisory committee on women's affairs said, "We haven't received enough complaints to real-

ly justify any concern" over the problem.

And without a state law on the matter, the committee will not enter the field, she indicated.

(Minnesota has regulations on women's maximum hours of work—54 hours per week—and minimum wages. Efforts to prohibit sex discrimination in jobs were dropped during the 1967 legislative session to improve chances for passage of the new state human rights department bills.)

Even with laws there are problems in the field, Mrs. Kanatz admitted, because women often hurt their own chances: "Like some brainwashed minority group members, many women are afraid to take supervisory positions."

THIS PROBLEM is echoed in the South St. Paul controversy, where one woman active in the EEOC case complained, "It isn't only the company we fight—it's also some of our women . . . They won't try for the new jobs."

Several women in the original complaint group later dropped their charges.

"Women I've worked with for 20 years wouldn't speak to me" at one point in the dispute, recalled Mrs. Sokolowski.

But with families to help support, insurance premiums to pay, time payments to meet, and pension and fringe benefit rights built up, the 18 women are not willing to give up the fight.

THEY WERE finally recalled to work after a five-month layoff during the fall and winter of 1965-66, but many have had uneven employment since then —

an experience they don't feel is deserved after 18 years' service.

"They've taken the best years of our lives," said Miss Birch.

The women charge that Swift has brought "young boys off the street" to do jobs women could do — a charge more easy to find support for before April 25, 1966, when the plant merged its separate male and female seniority lists to comply with Title VII.

COMPANY officials have refused to discuss the dispute, pointing to a "no comment" agreement made with the EEOC while the matter is pending.

The EEOC has stated that while Swift has reclassified jobs, "it has not done so under any systematic procedure," however.

Commented Miss Birch: "If they'd only bend a little, and uncombine some jobs, they wouldn't have this trouble . . . But when a new job is open, they don't try it out on a female."

THE EEOC found that when Miss Birch and five other women were called back to work in April 1966, they were offered various jobs and then laid off for "unsatisfactory performance."

But in each case, according to the EEOC, "The job was subsequently reclassified by the company as an A job" (men only).

These jobs ranged from cleanup work with heavy high-pressure hoses, to hog and sheep dressing.

Mrs. Shirley Pawlenty told of seeing the packing cuts department close in 1966 after she had worked there 18 years.

Since then she has been

laid off, offered men's jobs, and now is continually switched within the plant.

Once Mrs. Pawlenty was given work in the Pork Cut — and was confronted with knife work, in which she was inexperienced. Later it was the Hog Kill: "This is not a place for women," she said.

"IF THEY would have offered us Mrs. Pawlenty Hog Kill 20 years ago, we wouldn't have gone to work for Swift & Co.," Mrs. Sokolowski added.

Now, the women agree, it's too late to start another career.

Jobs continue to be combined at Swift, and the work force shrinks. (This is unlike the situation at Armour & Co. in South St. Paul, where automation has been paralleled by plant expansion; some 2,600 workers are employed there.)

WEIGHING scale jobs formerly done by women at Swift have in some cases been combined with machine operator's jobs—requiring skills which the women lack. A sterilizing job was merged with that of carrying in supplies — cutting out the women again.

The women cite many such cases, but also allege that their union has not defended them.

"We women stood in the picket lines and fought for the benefits the union has," Mrs. Sokolowski emphasized. But she admitted that some of them felt they were "working against our friends" when they first filed formal charges against the union's Local 167, which represents Swift employees.

THE EEOC has stated that Local 167 quit participating in the job reclassification talks "and has refused to process grievances alleging improper classification."

The Packinghouse Workers Union's involvement in the dispute is surprising to many, for the union has won many laurels for earlier programs on women's equal pay and better jobs for Negroes.

Victor Perez, Local 167 president, talked of Title VII, admitted there were insufficient guidelines, and agreed, "Over all, I think

it's a good law." But he argued that the Civil Rights Act "gives an opportunity to bid for a job — it doesn't give special privileges."

MEN as well as women have lost jobs to automation at Swift, Perez added.

The Local 167 newspaper reported following the women's layoff two years ago that most would be back at work soon: "But this will mean that there are many male employees who will be laid off because of this action, but the law is the law and the union must comply with it."

Last November the newspaper editorialized, "These are not easy times for either the union or the company, when the government passes a law such as Title VII which, in its simplest form, says a person is entitled to equal employment opportunity regardless of sex, and then throws the problems such a law can create into the hands of the company and union."

PEREZ SAID he feels there is basically no problem of sex discrimination. But, he added, "I would call it questionable as to whether we understand Title VII."

The union is not alone in being confused about Title VII. So is the EEOC.

The agency admitted that its first-year list of charges gave it some "surprises" — such as the fact that almost 40 per cent of the 8,854 complaints it was "deluged with" involved sex discrimination, not racial matters.

The EEOC also confessed in its first annual report that while racial bias in jobs was well-documented, "the legislative history was less complete insofar as discrimination based on sex was concerned."

BEYOND the lack of precedents to fall back on, the agency found that the 60-day period for carrying a proven charge through to conciliation has been almost impossible to meet.

Conciliation is the next process in the Swift dispute, if the EEOC finding is not changed — and if the women do not start an injunction suit on their own.

These legal problems caused Mrs. Kanatz of the State Department of Human Rights to comment, "It's almost frightening to see that so little development on guidelines has occurred on this . . ."

However, Mrs. Kanatz added, "society hasn't really decided what it wants to do with this issue."





MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org