

LANCASTER CLEANERS' CAMPAIGN

8p

Inadequate transport for University workers

EVER since the University moved from St Leonardsgate to its present site three miles out of Lancaster there have been serious problems of transport for the University workers.

During the vacations when are essential for the money-making there is no provided for them fore have to rely ley bus which only to the bottom rigg Hill leaving climb the last half during term-time tion of transport a grave problem for these workers as the the University bus to 10 to 12 per cent of wages. Students who same bus are able to re any fares which take up than 3 per cent of grants.

The University tries create an image of itself a liberal institution and model employer and yet th is the way the needs of it workers are ignored. It does not encourage the workers to organise through, or even join unions to fight for their

rights; it won't allow a closed shop yet neither does it respond to such reasonable demands as adequate transport.

Instead the repeated requests for transport have

ABOUT 350 Lancaster University students took university's main administrative block on Wednesday of a demand by cleaning staff for free transport to th

Administrative work was disrupted and staff had to move out to other parts of the university, including the Chaplaincy Centre, St Martin's College and the university build-

official channels to obtain proper transport and they are having to pay as much as 10 per cent of their wages in bus fares. They are even more concerned during vacations when the university bus service is considerably reduced and they often have to walk from the A6.

Mrs Audrey Lancaster, of Cabus, shop steward of the IGWU, said the cleaners could continue their strike until the University decided to give them something. Men cleaners who work at night are supporting the women's action similar one-hour stop-

University secretary, Mr A. Jen Jeffreys, said the present claim for free port from Lancaster and g seemed to contra- previous understanding University would pro- sport to and from the

He said the University consider the clean- at the earliest position their "unjusti- on had ceased.

"Arrangeme port to and i been approve- plemented." He described false" a clea office staff w free transport

The cleaners the Universit have talks they called c stoppages, b night the Un were willing cupation was

Councillor Labour mem Council and dent, said h and unreser the student cleaners' den one and he members of Trades Union port the occi demand was :

● The Lan and District ' fence Comu their support on: Wednesda

FREE TRANSPORT SUPPORT CLEANERS

Aiming women in trade un

THE INDUSTRIAL Relations Bill will most greatly affect the least organised and unionised groups of workers. This is because a whole range of action which workers now engage in to fight against injustice will become illegal e.g. organising strikes on the shopfloor on a localised issue such as the unfair dismissal of work-mates, the victimisation of shop-stewards etc. It is essential in the struggle against reducing these basic rights of working people that the full strength of the trade unions is used, and in this context we must realise that women particularly are poorly unionised.

with Moreca Defence Lancaster Group 38 Dallas Lancaster.

Produced by
LANCASTER
SOCIALIST
WOMAN
GROUP

A Socialist Woman Special

*****FREE TRANSPORT NOW*****

Lancaster Cleaners' Song

Chorus

We muck out the bogs for damn low wages
We're going to the dogs by easy stages
We don't wear clogs but it's the Middle Ages
—We want Free Transport Now.

Verse 1

We don't want much but we want fair do's
Most of our money on fares we lose
No more wet clothes and worn out shoes
—We want Free Transport Now.

Verse 2

Please Mr. Cantsfield you know it's only right
We've tried too long at being polite
We've got to win so we've got to fight
—We want Free Transport Now.

Verse 3

Give us a hand 'cos we want to win
We've started now and we won't give in
Giving up now would be a sin
We want Free Transport Now.

1

For a long time now women have been poorly unionised, due in the main to their family responsibilities: women have only been drawn into the labour force either in response to extraordinary societal conditions (e.g. war) or else through a need to supplement their husband's income. Therefore their consciousness is divided between being a "worker" and being a "wife and mother". Thus we see that women were only slowly admitted to the early General Labour Unions of the last century, when men began to stop regarding them only as rivals on the labour market. The whole history of their unionisation has lagged behind male unionisation during the development of the Trade Union movement. However over the past twenty years or so the rate of unionisation of women has been much higher than that of men, but women still only comprise twenty-one per cent of the membership of the T.U.C. In the same period an increased number of women have been going out to work and they have figured more in industrial action ^{recently than} since before the first world war; for instance the industrial action of the sewing women at Fords three years ago started off the whole equal pay movement. It is interesting to note that the TUC accepted the principle of equal pay in 1885, but despite the significant gains that women achieved in this period, to some extent by their own organisations, the principle has by and large only been paid lip service. The Equal Pay Act, which will be enforced by 1975, is completely inadequate, only dealing with limited sections of women's work.

In general, the gains of the working class movement have been made by use of the main strength it has, its ability to take industrial action in unity. Over the past decade or so the working class has made

some inroads into profit margins because of its united action in different industrial spheres. Some spheres have a history of greater militancy than others and it is where unionisation is strongest that the greatest gains have been made.

So if we link these factors, the general "lag" in the unionisation of women and the fact that working class consciousness (expressed in its militancy) is greatest where there is strong unionisation, together with the great potential women have for militant action, we see that the possible strength of women, if they were organised, is enormous. It is also clear that there are vast areas where women who are aware of the general subordination of their sex can work with working women. These are the numerous areas where women receive low wages and work in bad conditions. It was these considerations that led the Lancaster Socialist Woman Group to find out more about the conditions of working women in this particular locality. In Lancaster there has been little Trade Union militancy to oppose the prevalent low wages, etc: Lancaster is quickly hit in a period of recession as at the present time. The unemployment rate is over 5%, well above the national average.

Of course we do not think that even full unionisation (although a necessary first step) of women could solve all the problems. All militant sections of the working class soon come up against the bureaucratic nature of the Trade Union organisations, the unwillingness of the officials to act, the red tape etc. Joining and becoming active in a union can lead to a consciousness of the conflicts in our society, but cannot by itself resolve them. Women can become aware of their subordinate position very directly in this way.

This must then be linked with an understanding of why their position is so, together with an understanding of their role in the family, itself the result of human relationships distorted by class society. It is this realisation that will lead women to see that their position cannot be satisfactorily changed in capitalist society. Our work with cleaners in Lancaster University was only a small step in this direction, but we wish to document it in this pamphlet in order to show what the cleaners achieved and how we were able to work with them.

RESUME OF EVENTS

The university authorities have attempted to dismiss the occupation by students of the Administration building last June (1971) either as an end of term jaunt or as a 'red plot'. A simple investigation indicates that this struggle by the cleaners, supported by the Socialist Woman Group, had been a long one culminating in the events of June 14 to 18. Only after all the official channels had been exhausted and the cleaners' patience worn down by the delaying tactics of the management did these actions take place.

For over five years, since the University moved to its present site at Bailrigg the University workers have made repeated demands for transport facilities. The fact that they were so long ignored indicates the appalling nature of industrial relations in the university, a point discussed in depth later. The Socialist Woman Group began talking to the cleaners of the residence blocks at the beginning of the academic year 1970-1. From these talks it became apparent that the cleaners shared a common dissatisfaction with transport arrangements, which were quite inadequate. No transport was provided in between student terms for the university workers and fares were eating up 10% to 20% of their income. Lunchtime meetings were arranged by the Group with the cleaners every week. Thus the cleaners formed a good relationship with the group and through them with the student body. More importantly they began to realise the benefit of uniting to put forward their complaints. Meetings with Audrey Wise and May Hobbs demonstrated that other women workers had found trade union organisation necessary to succeed with their claims. The Lancaster cleaners decided to join the Transport and General Workers' Union (in which

the night cleaners were organised) and elected Mrs. Lancaster as Shop Steward. 22 out of 35 residence cleaners were now members.

After repeated efforts to push their demands through the 'appropriate' channels the cleaners, with official support from the T.&G.W.U., undertook strike action. The cleaners' actions had been publicized by the Socialist Women Group. The Group put out numerous leaflets to inform the students about the situation and in February presented a motion to Federation, the students' Union, supporting the cleaners' demands (which was passed). Finally the Group drew up a petition of c.1000 signatures ... again with no movement from the management. This is the long-term context in which the cleaners' strike action and the student occupation must be placed.

The decision to occupy was made by a large Federation meeting. Many further mass meetings were held during the occupation to discuss and decide on each further action. The University was effectively brought to a standstill with the occupation of both the administration building and the computer building. Although the management had previously refused to meet the cleaners until they stopped industrial action, by the end of the first day of the sit-in they were willing to do so, provided, of course, that the students withdrew. Clearly both expedients - withdrawing student support and stopping industrial action would have weakened the cleaners' bargaining position. Therefore, the occupation mass meeting, after hearing May Hobbs of the London night cleaners, who called for their continued support, voted to remain in occupation. This was in spite of a court order and injunctions being taken out against individual students. The University agreed to

THE CLEANERS AND THE UNION

When May Hobbs first spoke to the cleaners at the beginning of 1971 she warned them that any action that they wanted to take to better their conditions would have to be initiated by them. She demonstrated that her own experiences with the Union showed this to be true.

Some of the cleaners had been members of trades unions before; some were disillusioned but others recognised the importance of being unionised as a first step to improving their conditions of work. They joined the T.&G.W.U. firmly believing that if the majority of them did so they would be in a much stronger position than before. Once they had organised themselves into a Union the next step was to make the Union officials take up their demands. The first official, the District Secretary, decided that the simplest solution to their transport problem was the provision of a minibus to take them to and from the University to the A6 (a five minute bus journey) where the local public buses stop. Such a solution did not meet the cleaners' demands. The cleaners' situation is recorded in the minutes of the Joint Consultative Committee which states:

- a) during vacations, when the normal University bus service is suspended, there is a bus at 8.40 a.m. which costs 17½p return. As this is often full they are forced to use local public transport which costs 24p return and they are further inconvenienced by having to walk up the hill from the A6 to the University.
- b) the University bus service is satisfactory except during the vacations.

The cleaners therefore made it clear to the union official that the minibus was inadequate;

it went no way towards meeting their basic problems, the high cost of fares and the inadequacy of the service.

Nevertheless the District Secretary went ahead with the request for a minibus which the University agreed to (although they had been prevaricating about this for several weeks). So the cleaners wrote to the District Secretary asking that he put forward their demand for the provision of a bus to the University from Lancaster and from Galgate. In the meantime, however, the District Secretary had passed the cleaners' case over to the District Organiser, who put forward the cleaners' claim by mid-May. The union was by now under considerable pressure from the cleaners themselves, whose militancy was growing. A few weeks later the management had not changed its position, and the cleaners pressed for a token strike in support of their demands. The Union official had to support this. The cleaners mounted a militant picket on the Administration building from 10-12a.m. daily - their picket developed into a noisy demonstration which they led round the campus.

The male trade unionists in the University supported the demands of the cleaners, and it is interesting to note that as a result of the cleaners winning their case later in June the T. & G.W.U. gained negotiating rights at the University and a procedural agreement for its members. Thus militant action on the part of the women workers brought direct benefits to all the workers on the campus.

It is in the perspective of more recent events that we see the nature of the union officials. Their attitude to the cleaners was essentially paternalistic they were there to "see what they could do",

i.e. report on what had taken place. They would negotiate with management without a representative of the cleaners being there, and when the issue of the bus had been settled they allowed the University to institute a clocking system, against the wishes of the cleaners.

Before the women cleaners joined the Union, one of its officials admitted that they had not paid as much attention to getting workers at the University unionised as they should have done. In this context the women cleaners, when they had got themselves organised, gave a clear lead and received support from different parts of the labour movement. They were not bound by years of traditional trade unionism and quickly moved to militant action.

The University has claimed to welcome unionisation in its premises and where cleaners can be openly recruited. In fact the Union has no members in the premises and the University is the only major employer of U.G.W. in the area. In the district which does not create a check-off system to facilitate the collection of Union dues. As part of the process of a Federal Employer it has not yet formed a committee to represent the interests of its employees. The management has imposed its views. When criticism is made inside the management tries to suppress it. For example when the Retailers Union Group proposed a leader representing the committee of the district staff a meeting was called by the management of which the district staff were excluded to identify themselves. In such a situation they naturally felt that their livelihood was threatened on the management was a "produce committee" June 1951. The Joint Consultative Committee is the only body

THE UNIVERSITY AS AN EMPLOYER

It has already been shown that the University Management ignored the cleaners' demands until they were forced into more militant action. On the second day of their token strikes a minibus was provided, although this had previously been rejected by Mr. Andrews, the staff officer, as too expensive, impractical, and unnecessary. The failure of the Management to act until strike action was taken indicates the 'effectiveness' of its system of negotiations.

Here are two excerpts from leaflets produced by the Socialist Woman Group which show how the University discourages its workers from organising in trade unions and sets up organisations which are dominated by the management and where cleaners can be openly intimidated.

"The University has claimed to welcome unionisation but in fact the Union has no negotiating rights and the University is the only major employer of T.G.W.U. labour in the district which does not operate a check-off system to facilitate the collection of Union dues. As part of its posing as a liberal employer it has set up joint consultative committees, the structures of which enable the management to impose its views. When criticisms arise outside these bodies the management tries to suppress them. For example, when the Socialist Woman Group brought out a leaflet expressing the complaints of the catering staff a meeting was called by the management at which the catering staff were challenged to identify themselves individually with the criticisms. In such a situation they obviously felt that their livelihood was threatened so the management was able to produce minutes of the meeting stating that there were no complaints." June 1971

"The Joint Consultative Committee is the only body

11

on which the staff are represented; it comprises about 50% administrative and managerial staff and 50% representatives from the tradesmen and general workers. Quite fair it appears. However there are a few factors to be taken into account. The following conversation took place during a meeting of this body set up to promote "the free flow of ideas from staff to management".

Employer: Why do you work here?

Cleaner: For the money

Employer: Why not anywhere else

Cleaner: There are no other jobs

Employer: Well, if you don't like it you can
leave.

Cleaner: What, all of us?

Employer: Yes, all of you.

Also, decisions taken at this meeting were stated in the minutes as

(a) The University should not subsidize transport for female cleaners.

(b) The cost of any transport arranged should be borne by the employees.

(c) The distance between the A6 bus stop and the University was considered to be a reasonable walking distance.

As 50% of the people present are supposed to represent the assistant staff who have constantly complained about the distance, it is strange that they should have reached conclusion (c). In fact, no voting took place, and no decisions were reached. The results from this committee go to the Assistant Staff Committee. This is composed totally of administrative and academic staff with councillors from Blackburn, and is appointed by the Council. It has autonomous and complete power to

accept and reject proposals from the Joint Consultative Committee. It will meet next week to consider the present proposals for a bus service.

As the day cleaners have not been represented by a union and this completely one-sided system has been the only available mechanism for negotiation, it is hardly surprising that the cleaners have not had a bus service during the vacations for the last five years, that they have to eat their meals in cramped utility rooms surrounded by their work materials, and that they have been warned not to talk to students." May 1971

The Management have tried to cover up their delaying tactics over the question of transport by maintaining that they were not officially informed of the demand by the T.G.W.U. in time for them to act before the strike. Their claim, that they did not know what the cleaners were demanding, is a distortion. It is true that T.U. officials made differing demands, but the cleaners and their shop steward had repeatedly made their demands clear to the Management. In any case, the official confusion was cleared up a month before the cleaners' action.

There are other examples which show the University's attitude to industrial relations. Strikers were called to a union meeting and found that the Management had brought in non-union members and supervisors. When the strikes and the occupation were over, the University attempted to retract the transport allowance agreed in the negotiations, which was the basis for the ending of the strikes and the occupation, and substitute an equal pay rise to which they were already necessarily committed under the terms of the Equal Pay Act. Subsequently they had to be forced to go back to the original agreement. The Management have now retaliated by introducing a clocking in system for just one section of University workers . . . the cleaners.

THE POSITION OF THE CLEANERS IN THE UNIVERSITY

Even before the cleaners had begun actively to make demands it was clear that they were very poorly paid and treated like second class citizens in the University. The following is an excerpt from a leaflet written by the Socialist Woman Group:

"Women residence cleaners work at the University from 9.15 a.m. to 3.30 p.m. with half an hour for lunch and are paid £9-37 per week, while students' income is approximately £12 per week and that of the academic staff is from £25 per week. Out of the £9-37 that cleaners get, at least 87p per week goes on bus fares; this represents about 10% of their income and while students and academic staff pay fares at the same rate, students can claim fare rebates in excess of £12 per annum, which is about 3% of their income. At the same time the bus service is geared to serve those who work during the academic term and ignores those workers who serve to keep the University going during the vacations for money-making events such as conferences. There is virtually no service during vacations for these people, although this has been requested for years.

Academic staff and students are provided with ample facilities for refreshment, refectories, common rooms and bars, while cleaners frequently have access to a small Utility room, or a corner of a room designated for another purpose; catering staff in one college have been asking for some time for a room in which to eat their lunch. This was denied them until recently when the Management became worried by the contact his staff were having with students.

Cleaners and Students

Students are a relatively priveleged social group and are not so directly affected by economic and political developments. But in the recent period in which working class organisation and living standards have been under savage attack from the Tory government desperate to maintain profit margins, students in many parts of the country have passed resolutions and demonstrated against the Industrial Relations Bill and in support of workers' struggles. The struggle of the University cleaners brought to many of them an issue that they could not avoid. The socialist woman group was able both to work with the cleaners in the development of their struggle, and to bring the students into action in support of the cleaners. In this wqy it has perhaps given a new direction to student politics.

The University has a much talked about liberal face, but what happened when this issue came up? In fact the demand for free transport for the cleaners was supported by a large number of students, academic staff and other University workers, for example the petition was signed by about 1,000 people. But the University management refused to provide it; only after the beginning of the token strike did it supply a minibus up and down the hill. On Tuesday 15th June the Socialist Woman Group proposed to the student federation that students should demonstrate their support for the cleaners by occupying the University administration buildings if the cleaners' full demands were not met by the following day. On the Wednesday the University management had not moved; it was two weeks before the end of term, when the transport was most urgently needed and when the students would have left. It looked likely that the matter would not be settled quickly since it was already over a month since the formal request for free transport had been made.

This was why at mid-day, Wednesday 16th June the student federation voted to move into occupation of the University administration buildings. A large proportion of those who had supported the cleaners' demands were thus brought into solidarity action. By the Wednesday evening, as reported in the next day's Guardian,

L 6

"The Senate made its first concessionary move... when it sent a message to the 'occupation forces' that if the sit-in were called off over-night it would be willing to meet the cleaners 'to clarify their desire about Union representation and negotiation and the precise nature of their claim with the intention that negotiations should proceed forthwith'". There was no question about union representation, and the actual claim had been stated over a month before, so there was clearly no case for leaving the building.

On the following evening, Thursday, the Vice-Chancellor took out injunctions against three students. This was an autonomous action, taken against the majority decision of a Committee set up especially to deal with the issue of the occupation. Despite the fact that the occupation was still going on the next day, the University began negotiations with the cleaners, and a settlement of £1.20 was agreed upon to cover the cost of transport. Thus the liberal wing of the University administration was seen to be opposed to taking legal action against students; however, the Vice-Chancellor had shattered his carefully built liberal image by acting autonomously.

The experience of the occupation also exposed the nature of the President of the Student representative council, within the University and the N.U.S. nationally. The N.U.S. sent a representative to Lancaster to express their "unqualified support" for the occupation, yet when that same night we appealed to them for legal advice and representation for the victimised students we were told "you're on your own". Worse still was the behaviour of the S.R.C. President, Tim Hamlett. During the occupation all decisions concerning organisation, press statements etc., were taken at mass meetings of Federation, but the President took it upon himself to enter into private negotiations with the Vice-Chancellor without being mandated by the Meetings to do so. He wished to withhold the statement he received from the V.C., but the meeting, by an overwhelming majority, forced him to hand over the statement for publication.

17

Finally it must be recognised how students were directly and effectively drawn into solidarity with workers' struggles, and that positive links were established both with University workers and other groups of workers in Lancaster. Workers from the Trades Union Defence Committee gave their support to the student occupation and came to speak to the student meetings. Several of the male University workers as well as the cleaners thanked the students for their action at the end of the occupation. It is hoped that the good relationships made during the occupation will be more firmly established and developed.

Students already work in the Unemployment Action Group set up by the Trades Union Defence Committee, in the Tenants Associations, and have representatives on the Trades Council. Perhaps the press coverage of the occupation has dismissed some common ideas about students 'wasting tax-payers money', and shown where their solidarity lies in the class struggle between workers and the ruling class.

Conclusion

We in the socialist woman group, although we were hampered by our lack of experience in such work, consider this campaign to have been a success. Our lack of experience was shown in the occupation, where we were aware that the organisation could have been better; we could have organised meetings round the socialist woman group, and we intend to discuss the shortcomings of the occupation ourselves.

We think the need for a socialist woman group has been established as a result of this campaign- few other groups are orientated towards working class women and develop their ideas and practice in this direction. Working class women are doubly oppressed in class society; they provide a pool of cheap labour, which is justified by their "special" extra responsibilities in the family.. Analysis of class society reveals vast areas where women are in such a subordinate situation, so the need for separate socialist women's groups is based on this. The socialist women group is necessary in a practical sense because few socialists group realise that women will not be automatically drawn into the Trade Union Movement in the same way as men are.

Our work with Lancaster University cleaners leads us to two general conclusions:-

- (a) This work was just a first step with a small group of women. Some of them had already been members of Unions, but they all found that in order to get what they wanted they had to organise themselves and make union representatives work for them. They are now open to all the problems which face workers in the Union movement. They find that everyone - the male trade unionists, the union officials, and of course the employers think they know what's best for them. Experience shows that only their own activity, organisation, and determination can achieve their objectives;
- (b) We think that the work of the Socialist Woman Group in mobilising hundreds of students in support of a workers' struggle has given a new direction to student politics. In a period of growing economic crisis with hundreds of thousands unemployed, (over 2,000 in Lancaster) the class struggle sharpens and students cannot remain impartial.

The reticence shown by the University management in only going half way to meet a reasonable demand from a small group of workers exposes the nature of a system which works for the benefit of a ruling minority. Liberalism is out - the question for women who are committed to their liberation and students is - do they want this system or a different kind of society which is organised by people for the people who work in it? The cleaners are beginning to exert some control over their work situation. We must continue work with them and show our solidarity with the working class.

Appendix

We reproduce here an interview between Mrs Lancaster, shop steward of the Lancaster University day cleaners, May Hobbs of the London night cleaners, and a member of Lancaster Socialist Woman Group. It was first published in the 'Red Mole' 1st July 1971.

(It is produced here somewhat abbreviated)

C. Young- The administration have repeatedly said that your demands are not clear- is there any confusion about them?

A. Lancaster- No, it's quite simple+ we want a bus to run between Garstang and the University and another between Morecambe and the University.

C. Young- And would this be just for the 22 cleaners who had fought for it?

A.L.- Well, it's us who's fighting for it, but if they want to carry on working and then to come in with us after - well, that's up to them. We're not going to pressurise them.

C.Y.- Do you think your claim is justified and how confident are you that you will win the fight?

A.L. - I know it's justifiable. I have to pay 32½p every day, that's 20% of my wages. The Burnley-Lancaster bus that we have to use in the vacation is very unreliable - a few times we've had to wait from 3.30 until 5 o'clock for a bus that isn't full. Sometimes the

girls who live in Galgate (about three miles away) have to walk. We're all quite confident that we'll get somewhere - you have to be. I think we're so confident because it's been made into a big issue now, it's not just us and the management. We need the publicity. The students are getting most of the publicity but they're doing it on behalf of us.

C.Y. - What do you think of the students' support?

A.L. - I just can't say enough for them; we wouldn't have got this far without them; Some people say that students don't really care about workers and that they're only messing about, but they've been really good for us. We would have tried to stick it out without them, but we would have been forced to back down in the end.

May Hobbs; It was the same in London, with the students and the Socialist Woman groups. They put such a lot of work into it.

A.L. - Yes, they've been running about here for us, arranging meetings, writing leaflets and letters to the paper - we appreciate it very much.

C.Y. - What do you think about the way you've been treated by the management?

A.L. - They've been really pig-headed about negotiations - we didn't want any trouble but their pig-headedness forced us into it..... Before we started having meetings we used to be scared just as some of the other university workers are now.

C.Y. - Have the union officials been helpful in this campaign? The administration claim that they have in fact confused your demands.

A.L. - Well, at first they were a dead loss, we were getting nowhere, but lately they have been getting better.

M.H. - If you push them, like you've done they have to, don't they?

A:L: - Yes - well, we've been pushing Mr. Taylorson all the time. In future we're going into meetings with him. We're all going in to-morrow. We used to sit quiet in meetings but we've been pushed about so long that we're not frightened.

M:H: - Yes, you've really got to make the unions work for you. It's no good waiting for the officials to move while you just sit there.



SOCIALIST WOMAN

NATIONAL PAPER OF THE SOCIALIST WOMAN GROUPS

July—August 1971

5p



Lancaster Cleaners Strike

Socialist Woman Groups

BIRMINGHAM: Phyllis Tinsley, 102 Arden Grove, Edgbaston.

BRISTOL: Viv Prior, 7 Ravenswood Road, Redland, Bristol 6.

CARDIFF: Susan Lukes, 92 Llandaff Road, Canton.

***COVENTRY:** Pauline Walsh, 6 Cannon Close.

***EDINBURGH (area):** Anne McLellan, 5 Victoria Place, Bo'ness, West Lothian.

GLASGOW: Shelley Charlesworth, 61 Fergus Drive, Glasgow N.W.

HULL: c/o M. Ball, 305 Beverley Road, HU5 1LG.

LANCASTER: Margaret Coulson, 35 West Road.

LEICESTER: Jean Holman, 7 College Street.

LONDON (North & Central): Felicity Trodd, 182 Pentonville Road, London N.1. (Ring 01-837 6954, daytime, or Jackie Hayman, 01-607 3553, evenings).

LONDON (West): Leonora Lloyd, 40 Inverness Road, Southall, Middx. (01-574 7407).

MANCHESTER: Sheila Cohen, 43 Brantingham Road, Whalley Range, Manchester 16.

***NORWICH:** Fiona Fadenburgh, 199b Unthank Road.

***NOTTINGHAM:** Sue Lee, 8 Derby Grove, Lenton.

OXFORD: Judy White, 27 Southmoor Road.

STAFFORD: Mrs. Anna Booton, Flat 7, 28 Crescent Road, Rowley Park.

***YORK:** Julia Baldersam, 1 Longfield Terrace (off Bootham).

*If you are interested in forming a group in this area, please write to the address given.

Pamphlet produced by the London Socialist Woman Group.

How the contract cleaning industry works, what the campaign is about, what the cleaners think of it, what the unions are doing.

Facts and analysis for the women's liberation movement from a socialist point of view.

Individual copies 18p including postage.

Bulk orders (10 or more) 12½p each.

(Cash with order)

182 Pentonville Road, London N.1.

Read **SOCIALIST WOMAN**

for news of women's struggles in industry and the women's liberation movement.

For sample copy, send 8p to:

SOCIALIST WOMAN,
182 Pentonville Road, London N.1.

Please send me *Socialist Woman* for the next year. I enclose 48p, which includes postage & packing.

Name

Address

.....

Occupation

Send to: **SOCIALIST WOMAN SUBS,**
182 Pentonville Road, London N.1.

THE NIGHT CLEANERS' CAMPAIGN



15p

a
socialist woman special

Lancaster Socialist Woman Group meets each Thursday evening. For details of meetings and further information contact:-

Nina Thomas, Lancaster University

or

35 West Road, Lancaster.

RED BOOKS,
182 PENTONVILLE ROAD,
LONDON, N.1.
837-9987.