

COPY

February 5, 1968

Mrs. Rosemary Sokolowski
234 Sixth Avenue North
South St. Paul
Minnesota 55075

Dear Mrs. Sokolowski:

This is in further reply to our recent correspondence concerning Cast No. 6-402606 of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

I thought you might be interested to know that legislation is pending before the 90th Congress which would provide a greater degree of protection in this regard. That bill, S. 1308, would greatly strengthen the Commission's enforcement power and would enable the Commission to engage in more successful conciliation efforts. Hearings have been heard on the bill and it has been reported from a Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

You may be sure that I will continue to follow the progress of this bill closely. A copy of it is enclosed for your consideration.

With warmest regards.

Sincerely,

Walter F. Mondale

Enclosure

Memorandum

TO : Mr. Gary Avery
Office of Senator Mondale

DATE: January 2, 1968

FROM : Warren I. Cikins *Warren I. Cikins*
Director of Legislative Affairs

In reply refer to:

SUBJECT:

Per our conversation, I am returning this letter from Mrs. Rosemary Sokolowski. There is really nothing more we can tell her than we already have and we feel that she is looking to the Senator for advice on what else she can do. My only suggestion in that regard is that you might mention to her that legislation is pending in the Senate, S. 1308, which would strengthen the enforcement powers of the Commission and enable the Commission to engage in more successful conciliation efforts.

I am sorry that I cannot be more helpful to you on this matter. Also, please forgive the delay in responding, but we have had an especially large number of case referrals in the last month.

encl.



DATE:

Dec. 14, 1967

United States Senate

RE:

Mrs. Rosemary Sokolowski
234 6th Ave. No.
South St. Paul, Minn.

Respectfully referred to

Equal Employment Opportunity
Commission

.....
For your consideration of the attached
letter, and for a report.

 X To be forwarded directly to the
constituent, with a copy to me
for my information and records.

 To me, in duplicate to accompany
return of enclosure.

 As requested below.

Additional comments:

Please refer response to attention of
Mr. Avery, of my staff,
on the outside of the envelope only.

Thank you.

WALTER F. MONDALE
U.S. SENATE

CC 623-

P.C.

234 6th Avenue North
South St. Paul, Minnesota 55075
November 25, 1967 ✓

Senator Walter F. Mondale
Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Mondale:

As a follow-up to my correspondence to you dated November 18, 1967, I am enclosing a copy of a letter from Mr. Robert L. Randolph, Acting Director of Compliance, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, dated November 22, 1967, and a copy of my letter of reply to same.

I hope that you have a chance to read the copy I enclosed of Swift's letter to their Employees regarding their being subjected to political and journalistic pressures in the recent meat inspection campaign, of which you have been such an intriguing part. As a member of the consumer public, I must thank you and your colleagues for the long dedicated hours spent in getting regulations through for our protection. I am hoping the enforcement of same will soon be forthcoming.

Since I have tried to the best of my ability, with my limited means, to keep you informed as to the women's problem here with Swift & Company, I hope that you have been able to see what is necessary in the line of protection for women in future legislation and perhaps can point this out to the ones responsible for formulating such legislation.

You no doubt know of many more cases such as ours that have had to have the aid of the Federal Government in bringing about a just settlement for the employees. With the pattern of practices that Swift & Company have been enjoying and getting by with calling it Title VII, with no one to come to our aid, they should be able to clear us women out of their doors in a very short time, with nothing for our efforts. This hardly seems a just reward for all these many years of service to an employer. Is there anything being done by government to protect women caught in just such a predicament as we at Swift's? I realize we have the EEOC, but I am curious to know of any protective legislation.

Again I thank you Senator Mondale for the interest you have shown in our case.

Yours truly,

Rosemary Sokolowski
Rosemary Sokolowski

enc:2



EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

NOV 22 1967

In Reply Refer to:
Case No. 6-4-2606 et al
Swift & Company
So. St. Paul, Minn.

Mrs. Rosemary Sokolowski
234 6th Avenue North
South St. Paul, Minn.

Dear Mrs. Sokolowski:

This will acknowledge your telegram of November 10, 1967.

As you are aware, the Commission decision in your case was rendered on September 26, 1967. Under our regulations, the company may seek reconsideration of the decision. Swift and Company has availed itself of this right.

The Commission will advise you of its decision after reconsideration.

For your information, the Commission does not have enforcement powers. We will attempt to resolve the problems presented on your case by conciliation, should the Commission decide not to modify our decision.

If you wish to request a notice of your right to litigate this matter prior to the time we undertake conciliation, you may do so. Please direct your request to me, at 1800 G Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

We appreciate your concern for the delay in handling this matter, but the problem is complex and we wish to give full opportunity to all parties to present information which would justify a modification of our decision.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Robert L. Randolph", is written over the typed name.

Robert L. Randolph (Acting)
Director of Compliance

COPY^a

December 14, 1967

Mrs. Rosemary Sokolowski
234 6th Avenue North
South St. Paul
Minnesota 55075

Dear Mrs. Sokolowski:

Thank you so much for your recent letters. I am most grateful for your thoughtfulness in keeping me apprised of developments regarding Case No. 6-4-2606 of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

I also want to express my gratitude for your generous remarks concerning the strict meat inspection legislation which has now received final Congressional approval. We came from no bill at all to a very strong one in a short period of time because an outraged consuming public made its wishes known in no uncertain terms. My thanks to you and your associates for your part in this.

I do share your concern about the delay in handling the matter now before the Commission. I know you recognize the importance, however, of guaranteeing due process of law in these proceedings. Since the 60 day voluntary compliance period has now expired, I am again contacting the Commission requesting a detailed report on the case.

To the best of my knowledge, no legislation such as that you describe is now pending in the Congress. However, I will certainly give the problem personal study as I plan for the second session of the 90th Congress.

With best wishes for a happy holiday season.

Sincerely,

Walter F. Mondale

Dec. 14, 1967

COPY

Mrs. Rosemary Sokolowski
234 6th Ave. No.
South St. Paul, Minn.

Equal Employment Opportunity
Commission

X

Mr. Avery

234 5th Avenue North
South St. Paul, Minnesota 55075
November 25, 1967

Senator Walter F. Mondale
Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Mondale:

As a follow-up to my correspondence to you dated November 18, 1967, I am enclosing a copy of a letter from Mr. Robert L. Randolph, Acting Director of Compliance, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, dated November 22, 1967, and a copy of my letter of reply to same.

I hope that you have a chance to read the copy I enclosed of Swift's letter to their Employees regarding their being subjected to political and journalistic pressures in the recent meat inspection campaign, of which you have been such an intriguing part. As a member of the consumer public, I must thank you and your colleagues for the long dedicated hours spent in getting regulations through for our protection. I am hoping the enforcement of same will soon be forthcoming.

Since I have tried to the best of my ability, with my limited means, to keep you informed as to the women's problem here with Swift & Company, I hope that you have been able to see what is necessary in the line of protection for women in future legislation and perhaps can point this out to the ones responsible for formulating such legislation.

You no doubt know of many more cases such as ours that have had to have the aid of the Federal Government in bringing about a just settlement for the employees. With the pattern of practices that Swift & Company have been enjoying and getting by with calling it Title VII, with no one to come to our aid, they should be able to clear us women out of their doors in a very short time, with nothing for our efforts. This hardly seems a just reward for all these many years of service to an employer. Is there anything being done by government to protect women caught in just such a predicament as we at Swift's? I realize we have the EEOC, but I am curious to know of any protective legislation.

Again I thank you Senator Mondale for the interest you have shown in our case.

Yours truly,

Rosemary Sokolowski
Rosemary Sokolowski

enc:2



EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

NOV 22 1967

In Reply Refer to:
Case No. 6-4-2606 et al
Swift & Company
So. St. Paul, Minn.

Mrs. Rosemary Sokolowski
234 6th Avenue North
South St. Paul, Minn.

Dear Mrs. Sokolowski:

This will acknowledge your telegram of November 10, 1967.

As you are aware, the Commission decision in your case was rendered on September 26, 1967. Under our regulations, the company may seek reconsideration of the decision. Swift and Company has availed itself of this right.

The Commission will advise you of its decision after reconsideration.

For your information, the Commission does not have enforcement powers. We will attempt to resolve the problems presented on your case by conciliation, should the Commission decide not to modify our decision.

If you wish to request a notice of your right to litigate this matter prior to the time we undertake conciliation, you may do so. Please direct your request to me, at 1800 G Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

We appreciate your concern for the delay in handling this matter, but the problem is complex and we wish to give full opportunity to all parties to present information which would justify a modification of our decision.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Robert L. Randolph", is written over a horizontal line.

Robert L. Randolph (Acting)
Director of Compliance

234 6th Avenue North
South St. Paul, Minnesota 55075
November 25, 1967

Robert L. Randolph
Acting Director of Compliance
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
1800 G Street N. W.
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Randolph:

Re: Case No. 6-4-2606

I thank you for your letter of November 22 in reply to my November 10th telegram. I trust this letter shall also serve as an answer to my letter of November 18, 1967.

Your letter states that Swift & Co. is availing itself of the opportunity of reconsideration of the decision handed down by the Commission, and that I, in turn, will be notified of any modification of the decision after reconsideration. Are we, the aggrieved parties, to take this to mean that the ten (10) page decision which the Commission has so laboriously spent some 20 months investigating and compiling, isn't worth the paper that it's printed on? I'm sure that both Swift & Co. and the Union were given every opportunity during this lengthy investigation, to bring their side of this case to the attention of the Commission for consideration. I can see no need for any further delay in bringing about a cessation of the unfair pattern of practices which Swift & Co. is bringing to bear upon us women. I am sure there is no amount of money Swift & Co. could be asked to pay that could repay us women for the mental and physical strain which we have had to under go these many long months. We ask no more and expect no less than what is justly ours.

Your letter further states that the decision was rendered September 26, 1967. The 60 days allotted for voluntary compliance after the charge is filed, which is provided for in paragraph 4 of the Enforcement rights, expires November 26, 1967. Since Swift and Company and the Union have been and still are in violation of Title VII, and since the Commission has no enforcement powers, there is no other alternative for the aggrieved parties but to request litigation of this case immediately.

Would you please inform me as to how I might get a complete summary of the decision and agreement reached involving the Dubuque Packing Plant of Iowa, dated January 25, 1967 and also the same involving the Rath Packing Company of Waterloo, Iowa, dated Feb. 8, '67.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours truly,

Rosemary Sokolowski

cc:
Vice-Pres. Hubert Humphrey
Senator Eugene Mc Carthy
Senator Walter Mondale
Clifford Alexander, EEOC
Edward Kelley, EEOC? Chicago
Viola Kenatz, State of Minn. Human Rel.
George Barton, FBI

234 6th Avenue North
South St. Paul, Minnesota 55075
November 18, 1967

Senator Walter F. Mondale
Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Mondale;

I have noticed by the recent newspaper publicity and news casts that you are involved with efforts on stiffer meat inspections. I am enclosing a copy of a letter under date of November 17, 1967, from Swift & Company to the employees, which may be of some interest to you.

It is consoling to know that we have people in office like you who are interested in protecting the public. Legislation should also be forthcoming to protect the jobs and fringe benefits of the working people employed by big business.

I am also enclosing a copy of my letter of November 18, 1967, to Robert L. Randolph of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, as I know of your interest in our case now being handled by the Commission.

I am most grateful for all your cooperation extended us.

Yours truly,

Rosemary Sokolowski
Mrs. Rosemary Sokolowski

enc. 2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON
20210

*Culver,
Page*

REC'D FEB 28 1968

*File w/ 7-c
closed*

FEB 27 1968

Honorable Walter F. Mondale
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Mondale:

Your communication of February 6, 1968, with which you enclosed a letter you received from Mr. Page M. Collver of Culver, Minnesota, was forwarded to the Department of Labor by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for reply.

Your constituent's letter is returned herewith, together with a copy of our response, as requested.

Sincerely yours,

Frank V. Cantwell

Frank V. Cantwell
Legislative Liaison Officer

Enclosures

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON

20210

FEB 27 1968

Honorable Walter F. Mondale
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Mondale:

Your communication of February 6, 1968, with which you enclosed a letter you received from Mr. Page M. Collver of Culver, Minnesota, was forwarded to the Department of Labor by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for reply.

Your constituent's letter is returned herewith, together with a copy of our response, as requested.

Sincerely yours,

Frank V. Cantwell
Legislative Liaison Officer

Enclosures

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

WASHINGTON

20210

FEB 27 1968

Mr. Page M. Collver
Highway 33
Culver, Minnesota 55727

Dear Mr. Collver:

Your recent letter addressed to Senator Walter F. Mondale has been forwarded to the Department of Labor for reply.

The Secretary of Labor is charged by the Congress with the administration and enforcement of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967. This act was signed into law on December 15, 1967, but the earliest date on which it becomes effective is June 12, 1968. In the meantime, work is proceeding on analysis of the new law and informational material is being prepared for distribution to the general public as soon as possible. Your name has been added to our mailing list to receive such material as it becomes available.

We realize that the problem you present is an important one and it will receive careful attention as we proceed with the work of developing interpretations and policies in connection with the act's administration and enforcement. We are hopeful that the new statute will do much to lower the arbitrary barriers which have prevented so many workers from utilizing their full potential.

Sincerely yours,

Frank V. Cantwell
Legislative Liaison Officer

trip dck: 12 Culver, Minn.

Senator Walter Mondale
Washington, DC.

RECD JAN 22 1968

Way 33

Jan. 18, 1968

55727

NO PREVIOUS CORRESPONDENCE
IN GENERAL FILES

age

Dear Senator:

I wish to thank you for the quick response
I received from Health E. & Welfare on F.I.C.H. etc.

But I have another item that may be helpful
to you.

It is a common practice for these mills &
mfgs in this area to play hard to get on anyone over
their 50th Birthday. When it comes to hiring
N.W. Paper & all the paper mills in the Minn. & Wisc
Mich. area have a deal. They make anyone that
has passed their 50th Birthday sign a ~~waiver~~ Waiver
that they are not entitled to any pension privileges
before they will give them a job. The Union tried
to knock this out at current negotiations. But
N.W. Paper said they could see the Point but
would not be the first to break the practice.

If the decrimination against 45 to 65
could be slipped in as a rider on other legislation
it would knock this item cold.

N.W. Paper used to have a rule when a girl married
she was through. When the civil rights for women
was passed they posted a notice that if a male employee
married a female employee one would have to quit. But
they have not dared to enforce it. Sincerely
PAGEM COLLEGE

Page 10

P.S. N.W. Papp has hired a number of miners
for the Braunard mill from the Crosby
Dronton area. They have insisted on the
waiver of Pension rights as a condition
of employment. This is the old U.S. Steel
deal. They wanted the men to work on the
6th day. But gave them a waiver slip
they had to sign.

Page



February 6, 1968

Buck
COPY

Cr: 2-1

GA:

st

Page M. Collver
Highway 33
Culver, Minnesota

Congressional Liaison
Equal Employment Opportunities
Commission
Washington, D. C.

x

Gary Avery

CR: 2-1
COPY

April 2, 1968

Mrs. Donald Axberg
810 Queensland
Wayzata
Minnesota 55391

Dear Mrs. Axberg:

I want to thank you for your recent postcard. It was thoughtful of you to take the time to inform me of your opposition to legislation modifying the Equal Employment Oppportunity Act.

This legislation has not yet been debated on the Senate floor, but I will remain mindful of your concern when the legislation is receiving final action in the Senate.

With warmest regards.

Sincerely,

Walter F. Mondale

Dear Sen. Mondale:

Please vote "no"

if and when the Clark-Javits Bill for expanding EEOC powers comes to the floor for vote.

This request holds true for any similar proposal.

Mrs. Donald Arberg
810 Greenland
Wayzata, Minn.
55391

COPY

April 3, 1968

Mr. D. E. Axberg
810 Queensland Lane
Wayzata
Minnesota

Dear Mr. Axberg:

Thank you so much for your recent ~~post~~ card concerning legislation amending the Equal Employment Opportunity Act. I appreciate your courtesy in writing.

This legislation is, as you may know, presently receiving consideration in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Although I am not a member of that Committee I do appreciate having the benefit of your thinking on the legislation. I will certainly remain mindful of your opposition to the proposal when it is receiving active consideration on the Senate floor.

With warmest regards,

Sincerely,

Walter F. Mondale

gd.

Senate 9
RECD MAR 14 1968
Mondak;

This is to express
my emphatic negative
view of the Clark-Javits
bill for broadening the
powers of EEOC (currently
before the Labor & Public
Welfare Committee). This
"broadening" would make a
bad situation entirely intoler-
able.

Please vote "no" when
it reaches floor action.

D.E. AXBERG
810 QUEENSLAND LANE
WAYZATA, MINN.



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