UNC SCHOOL OF LAW

NORTH CAROLINA LAW REVIEW

Volume 38 | Number 2 Article 5

2-1-1960

Book Review

North Carolina Law Review

BOOK REVIEW

The Labor Reform Law. Washington: Bureau of National Affairs, 1959. Pp. 496. $8.50 (paper), $9.50 (boards).

The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959[1] incorporates in a single statute the first undertaking of the federal government to police the internal affairs of unions and a number of controversial amendments of strategic provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947. A confusing product of hastily drafted compromises between conflicting economic and political pressures, the statute raises difficult problems of interpretation and application.

The Labor Reform Law, prepared by the editors of the BNA labor reporting services, is designed to meet this need. It is not a definitive treatise—the book was published one week after the President signed the bill—but an informative and objective operations manual. It is arranged in three parts.

Part I, in 16 pages, embraces brief summaries of the law's background, impact and timetable; its effects upon unions, their officers and members; and its effects upon employers and labor relations consultants.

Part II, in 88 pages, the heart of the book, contains section-by-section analyses of the provisions relating to the bill of rights for union members, union reporting requirements, responsibilities of employers and consultants, trusteeships, election, removal, and regulation of union officers, and the Taft-Hartley amendments. These amendments are primarily concerned with federal-state jurisdiction (no man's land), voting by strikers, secondary boycotts, hot cargo agreements, organizational and recognition picketing, and construction industry contracts.

The topical analyses are revealing. Against the specific backgrounds of court and board decisions and legislative proposals, questions of interpretation and application are posed and answers suggested. An example is the treatment of the congressional solution for the "no man's land" situation. Section 14 of Taft-Hartley in a new subdivision (c) authorizes the NLRB, in its discretion, by decision or rule, to decline jurisdiction over any class or category of employers where it thinks the effect of the dispute on commerce is not sufficiently substantial, except where it would assert jurisdiction under its 1959 standards. And the state and territorial agencies and courts are to be free to take cases thus rejected by the NLRB.[2] At pages 75-81, the editors of *The Labor Reform Law*

[1] 73 Stat. 519 (1959), 29 U.S.C.A. §§ 401-531 (Supp. 1959).

[2] Compare Note, *Pre-emption and State Injunctive Enforcement of the "Right to Work" Law,* 36 N.C.L. REV. 502 (1958).

skeptically discuss the effects of these provisions upon the *Garner-Guss-Garmon* cases[3] which created the "no man's land," together with the new law's implications as to the limits upon NLRB's jurisdictional discretion, just what cases the states may handle, how jurisdiction is determined, and what law should be applied, state or federal, when the state agencies or courts deal with cases rejected by the NLRB.

Part III, in 382 pages, presents the legislative history of the new law as recorded in the House, Senate, and Conference committee reports and in the House and Senate debates. It also includes the text of the new law, the text of the Taft-Hartley Act as amended, and the 1959 jurisdictional standards of the NLRB.

There is a considerable overlapping and repetition between the three parts of the volume with respect to the history of the law's evolution. Perhaps this is justified by the complexities and controversies involved and by the importance of the legislative history in the discovery of the congressonal intention in particular situations.

As the new labor relations law runs the gamut of administration and litigation, this book will be helpful to those concerned.

M. T. VAN HECKE

University of North Carolina

[3] San Diego Building Trades Council v. Garmon, 353 U.S. 26 (1957); Guss v. Utah Labor Relations Bd., 353 U.S. 1 (1957); Garner v. Teamsters Union, 346 U.S. 485 (1953).