

IN THE MATTER OF

DETROIT AUTO DEALERS ASSOCIATION, INC, ET AL.

FINAL ORDER, OPINION, ETC., IN REGARD TO ALLEGED VIOLATION OF  
SEC. 5 OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT

*Docket 9189, Complaint,\* Dec. 20, 1984—Final Order, Feb. 22, 1989*

This final order requires, among other things, the Detroit, Mich.-area automobile dealerships to remain open a minimum of 64 hours a week for one year and to post conspicuously their hours of operation. The order prohibits all of the respondents from conspiring in any way to fix hours of operation, and requires the associations to amend their bylaws, rules, and regulations to eliminate any provision inconsistent with any provision of this order.

*Appearances*

For the Commission: *Dennis F. Johnson.*

For the respondents: *Katherine S. Nucci, Judy P. Jenkins & Howard E. O'Leary, Dykema, Gossett, Spencer, Goodnow & Trigg, Washington, D.C. J.F. Rill & Jeffrey W. King, Collier, Shannon, Rill & Scott, Washington, D.C. Glenn A. Mitchell, Stein, Mitchell & Mezines, Washington, D.C. Lawrence F. Raniszeski, Colombo & Colombo, Birmingham, Mi. Fred L. Woodworth, Dykema, Gossett, Spencer, Goodnow & Trigg, Detroit, Mi. and John F. Youngblood, Abbott, Nicholson, Quilter, Esshaki & Youngblood, Detroit, Mi.*

---

\*Complaint previously published at 108 FTC 193.

Initial Decision

111 F.T.C.

## INITIAL DECISION BY

JAMES P. TIMONY, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

JULY 14, 1987

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Commission's complaint, issued December 20, 1984, charges that 105 motor vehicle dealerships, 19 dealer associations, and 115 individuals in the Detroit area<sup>1</sup> agreed to close all day on Saturday and to limit evening hours to Monday and Thursday, in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. 45.

The complaint further alleged, in paragraph 5, that respondents attempted to coerce dealers into these hours of operation by threats of physical harm or property damage and by obstructing the business of dealers who did not comply.

The complaint also alleged, in Count II, that some of the respondents conspired to restrict newspaper advertising of motor vehicles.

In due course, respondents filed answers denying the substantive allegations and asserting affirmative defenses. The usual motion and discovery practice commenced.<sup>2</sup>

The Commission, on June 25 and August 6, 1986, dismissed 39 respondents and Count II of the complaint.<sup>3</sup> The trial began on July 10, 1986, with complaint counsel's case-in-chief concluding on July 17. Respondents then filed a motion to dismiss paragraph 5 of the complaint on grounds that complaint counsel failed to establish a prima facie case with respect to its allegations of coercion by respondents. Complaint counsel did not oppose the motion. The motion was granted on August 14, 1986.

Respondents' defense case began on July 21 and concluded on September 26, 1986. Complaint counsel's rebuttal case began on October 27 and concluded on October 29, 1986.

The record consists of 5,087 pages of trial transcript and about 4,000 exhibits. This includes the trial testimony of 74 witnesses, the

<sup>1</sup> "Detroit area" is defined as the Detroit, Michigan metropolitan area, comprising Macomb County, Wayne County and Oakland County in the State Michigan. (CX 3708)

<sup>2</sup> One unusual motion was by intervenor Post-Newsweek Stations, Inc. to videotape the trial. The motion was denied by order filed September 5, 1986.

<sup>3</sup> Other respondents have also been dismissed. Order of March 31, 1987; Commission order of November 27,

transcripts of 65 depositions and investigational [2] hearings, and stipulations as to what non-testifying respondents would have stated on direct examination if called to testify at trial.

The record was kept open after the conclusion of the trial for *in camera* motions by respondents and third parties (orders filed January 5 and January 27, 1987), and in order to afford the parties an opportunity to review transcripts and exhibits for correction of errors and the introduction of supplemental or modified exhibits into the record.<sup>4</sup> The parties filed proposed findings on April 21, 1987, and replies on June 5, 1987.<sup>5</sup>

## II. FINDINGS OF FACT

### A. Respondents

1. There are about 231 motor vehicle dealerships in the Detroit tri-county area franchised to sell new motor vehicles. (JX 2A-Z7.) Of these, 96 are respondents. Each dealership respondent is a member of both the Detroit Auto Dealers Association, Inc. ("DADA") and its respective line group association. (CX 175.)

2. There are 81 individual respondents. James Daniel Hayes has been the DADA executive vice president since January 1, 1975. All others all have owned or operated new car dealerships in Detroit. [3]

3. Eleven line group associations and six line group advertising associations are respondents in this proceeding. A line group is composed of dealers who sell the same line of cars. (CX 205H.) An advertising association conducts cooperative advertising with the car manufacturer. (JX 13A-B.)

4. Detroit Auto Dealers Association's members are Detroit area new car dealers. (CX 28E.) Only a few domestic dealerships and import dealerships in the Detroit area are not members. (CX 3824; Hayes Tr. 17, 19.)

5. DADA promotes the business affairs of its members by running the Detroit auto show, keeping statistical information concerning new

<sup>4</sup> See orders filed on January 20, 1987, March 10, 1987, March 12, 1987, March 31, 1987, April 14, 1987, April 16, 1987, April 29, 1987 and May 6, 1987.

<sup>5</sup> Proposed findings not adopted in the form or substance proposed are rejected, as either not supported by the entire record or as involving immaterial or irrelevant matters.

The following abbreviations are used throughout in citing to the record:

CX — (Complaint counsel's exhibits)  
 RX — (Respondents' exhibits)  
 JX — (Joint exhibits)  
 F. — (Finding)

Testimony is cited by the name of the witness, followed by transcript page.

car sales, and providing a forum for the exchange of ideas by its members. (Hayes Tr. 3919-20, 3939-44.)

6. The DADA is managed by its board of directors, consisting of one representative from each new motor vehicle line group that has at least seven members in the DADA. (CX 28G.)

*B. Interstate Commerce*

7. Except for respondent James Daniel Hayes, the other respondents do not contest having engaged in activities which are in or affect commerce.

8. James Daniel Hayes is Executive Vice President of the DADA. (Hayes Tr. 3917.) Mr. Hayes runs the association at the direction of the board of directors. (Hayes Tr. 3920.) Mr. Hayes is also engaging in activities which are in or affect commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act. (Hayes Tr. 3939-45.)

*C. Agreements to Restrict Hours*

9. Until 1959, Detroit area motor vehicle dealerships were open every weekday evening and on Saturdays. (CX 3866; Whelan Tr. 39, 11; CX 3853.)

10. A 1953 Michigan "blue law" prohibits any dealership from buying or selling new or used motor vehicles on Sunday. Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. §435.251 (West 1978). The DADA took an active role in pushing for the 1953 Sunday closing law. (CX 3537.) [4]

1. Agreements to Close Wednesday and Saturday Evenings

11. On June 22, 1959, the DADA Board of Directors announced that the great majority of dealers would welcome the opportunity to close their dealerships two nights a week. DADA sent a letter to its member dealers recommending that, effective July 1st, dealers close both their new car showroom and their used car lots, at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesdays and Saturdays. (RX 1, RX 2A.)

12. In July and August of 1959, the DADA advertised in the Detroit Free Press and Detroit News that dealers in the Detroit area were closing now at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesdays and Saturdays. (CX 3360, CX 3361, CX 3362.)

13. On August 17, 1959, the DADA announced considerable progress in its efforts to convince the dealers that they should close at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesdays and Saturdays. For four makes of cars, all dealers were closed. For five other makes of cars, only one dealer per

make was open. Overall, 70.5% of the dealers surveyed by the DADA were closed. (RX 3A.)

14. In August 1960, the Detroit area Chevrolet dealers voted at their line association meeting to close all new and used car and truck sales departments on Wednesdays and Saturdays at 6:30 p.m., and on six holidays. (CX 400A.)

15. On September 1, 1960, the DADA advised its members that Chevrolet dealers and Buick dealers had agreed among themselves to close their new and used car showrooms at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesdays and Saturdays. (CX 109A.)

16. On September 14, 1960, the Greater Detroit Chrysler Association announced that Chrysler dealers of Greater Detroit had agreed to close their new car showrooms and used car lots at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesdays and Saturdays. (CX 3378, CX 3379.)

17. On September 23, 1960, the DADA announced temporary increases in operating hours during the week that new 1961 model cars were being introduced but that all 13 line groups will resume their present policy of evening closings. (CX 111.)

18. By the end of 1960, the DADA hours limitation program had achieved widespread success. (CX 114.)

## 2. Agreements to Close Friday Evenings

19. On October 31, 1960, DADA wrote to the dealers announcing that the Wednesday and Saturday evening closings had proven very worthwhile and asked the dealers whether they would [5] like to add Friday evening closings to the other two evenings. (CX 112.)

20. On November 10, 1960, DADA announced that Lincoln-Mercury dealers had voted to close their dealerships at 6:00 p.m. on Friday evenings. (CX 113C.)

21. On December 8, 1960, DADA stated that 79% of the dealers indicated that they would be willing to close one additional evening, either Friday or some other evening in addition to Wednesdays and Saturdays. (CX 115A, CX 118D, CX 112, CX 114.)

22. At a meeting on February 23, 1961, at DADA headquarters, attended by DADA directors, several line group presidents and dealers from each line group, they decided to recommend to the dealers that they close their dealerships on Fridays at 6:00 p.m., beginning Friday, March 3rd. Each DADA member dealer was provided with four signs for the dealership's windows stating that: "This dealership closes at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays." (CX 120, CX 136E.)

23. At a meeting on March 8, 1961, the DADA Executive Committee decided to notify dealers that cooperation on the Friday evening closing had been excellent, and the majority of the dealers had been closing that evening. (CX 121A-B, CX 123A.)

24. On March 14, 1961, at a general meeting of the Greater Detroit Chevrolet Dealers Association, the Chevrolet dealers voted (with only one vote opposed) to add Fridays to their Wednesday and Saturday night closing, commencing March 24th. (CX 405.)

25. On November 21, 1961, the Ford dealers announced they would be closing at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, Friday and Saturday evenings. (CX 135.)

26. The DADA Board of Directors met on March 13, 1962 and discussed evening closings. (CX 138A.) This was part of what the DADA President described as: "our campaign of urging dealers to close their places of business at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday evenings." (CX 144C.)

27. The DADA Board of Directors, on November 13, 1962, discussed 15 Ford dealers who were remaining open on Friday evenings. "[I]t was decided that the directors should contact the offending Ford dealers and try to persuade them to resume their closing on Friday evenings." (CX 141A.)

28. At a DADA Board of Directors meeting on April 15, 1964, there was "a lengthy discussion of the ways and means by which DADA could police the evening closing program." (CX 153A.) [6]

29. A DADA survey in April 1964 showed that 88% of the DADA member dealers (203 out of 231 dealers) were in compliance with the evening closing program. Of the 28 dealers who were not in compliance, 14 were Ford dealers. Ten dealers said they would close all three evenings if a majority of the dealers did so. (CX 158.)

30. The DADA Board of Directors advised the dealers of the survey results. (CX 157B, CX 159.)

31. On April 21, 1965, Mr. Tope, the Executive Vice President of DADA, explained the DADA evening closing program. CX 164:

We are continuing our efforts to get all DADA members to close their dealerships at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays.

To that end we are attempting to determine which dealers are remaining open. After we learn this, we plan to write to each one soliciting his cooperation. If that fails, we will place advertisements in the suburban newspapers which cover the areas in which the uncooperative dealers are located, stating that new car dealers in Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb counties close at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays.

32. Mr. Tope then sent letters to 13 dealers urging them to close on Wednesday, Friday, or Saturday evenings. (CX 168A, CX 81A.)

33. At its June 15, 1965 meeting, the DADA Board of Directors authorized Mr. Tope to place ads in the Detroit newspapers stating that "DADA members in the tri-county area are closed Wednesday, Friday and Saturday evenings." (CX 81A.) In July, the DADA announced to the public that: "The Detroit Auto Dealers Association has established as the closing hour for all new car dealerships: 6 P.M. on Wed., Fri. and Sat. Evenings." (CX 3300.)

34. On September 28, 1965, the Board of Directors of the Greater Detroit Chevrolet Dealers Association agreed to a "regulation:" "All members of the Association will close all new and used car and truck sales departments on Wednesday, Friday and Saturday at 6:30 P.M." (CX 302A.) [7]

### 3. Agreements to Close Tuesday Evenings

35. The DADA Executive Vice President explained the joint evening closings in a March 18, 1966 letter to a dealer. CX 171:

Our association has worked on this evening closing project for several years, to a point where practically all new car dealers are closed three evenings a week. This situation has proven popular, not only with the dealership employees, but with the dealers themselves. They have found that they have been able to somewhat reduce their costs, and more importantly they have improved their grosses. This has been brought about by the fact that with fewer shopping hours, the public can devote less time to shopping, and consequently forcing down prices.

36. On July 11, 1966, the Board of Directors of the Greater Detroit Chevrolet Dealers Association ("GDCDA") voted unanimously to recommend to the membership that they close their dealerships on Tuesdays at 6:30 p.m. (CX 306A-B.) Later that day at the general meeting of the GDCDA, 20 dealers voted to close all sales departments at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesdays. By August 4, 1966, all Chevrolet dealerships except two had closed on Tuesday evenings. (CX 309B.)

37. DADA encouraged all dealers in the Detroit area to close their motor vehicle sales operations on Tuesday evenings. (CX 310A.)

### 4. Agreements to Close Saturdays During Summers

38. At a meeting of the Southeastern Michigan Volkswagen Dealers Association on April 4, 1967, the Volkswagen dealers unanimously agreed that all would close their sales rooms on Tuesday evenings. (CX 1308.)

39. On July 11, 1966, the Board of Directors and the general members of the Greater Detroit Chevrolet Dealers Association discussed closing the dealerships at 12:00 noon on Saturdays during the summer months. (CX 306B, CX 307B.)

40. At a meeting on March 26, 1969, members of the Metropolitan Detroit Pontiac Dealers Association voted unanimously to close their dealerships on Saturdays effective [8] May 31, 1969, but to reopen Tuesday evenings, for the summer months. (CX 209A, CX 211A, CX1309A.) The Chrysler-Plymouth dealers also agreed to close Saturdays during the summer. (CX 1309A; Burwell Tr. 2100; J. Thompson Tr. 1956-57.) On April 22, 1969, the Detroit Metropolitan Buick Dealers Association voted to close Saturdays and to open Tuesday evenings from May 30, 1969 through Labor Day. (CX 804C.) The majority of the Dodge dealers agreed to close on Saturday and open on Tuesday night during the summer. (CX 87C, CX 3307.)

41. By June 20, 1969, the Dodge, Chrysler-Plymouth, Pontiac, and Buick dealers, the Oldsmobile dealers (with two exceptions) and the Lincoln-Mercury dealers had decided to close on Saturdays for the summer, a total of 113 dealers. (CX 51.)

42. On May 1, 1970, DADA reported that the vast majority of Ford dealers had voted to close on Saturdays for the months of July and August. (CX 58, CX 90B.) By this time, about 95% of DADA members agreed to follow the DADA's recommendation to close Saturdays for July and August, 1970. (CX 607A, CX 608B-C.)

43. At the June 23, 1970 meeting of the Greater Detroit Chevrolet Dealers Association, all but two Chevrolet dealers voted to close on Saturdays for July and August. (CX 325B, CX 1409.)

44. On February 25, 1971, the Buick dealers voted unanimously to close on Saturdays from May 29, 1971 through September 4, 1971. (CX 812B.) In March 1971, the Chrysler-Plymouth dealers agreed to close Saturdays for June, July and August. (CX 519B.) On March 4, 1971, the Pontiac dealers agreed unanimously to close on Saturdays from May 29, 1971, through September 4, 1971. (CX 216B.)

45. In March 1971, the Lincoln-Mercury dealers decided to close on Saturdays from Memorial Day weekend through Labor Day weekend. (CX 1206, CX 93B, CX 95B.) A majority of the Oldsmobile dealers agreed to close Saturdays from May 29, 1971, through September 4, 1971. (CX 1111A.) The Pontiac, Buick, Oldsmobile, and Chrysler-Plymouth dealers agreed to close Saturdays from May 29, 1971 through September 4, 1971. (CX 217A.) A majority of the Dodge



dealers decided to close on Saturdays from May 29, 1971 through September 4, 1971. (CX 612B-C.)

46. At the May 10, 1971 meeting of the Greater Detroit Chevrolet Dealers Association, the members voted overwhelmingly to close on Saturdays in June, July and August through Saturday, September 4, 1971. (CX 329A, CX 1113A-B.) [9]

#### 5. Agreements to Close Saturdays Year-Round

47. On October 31, 1973, the Buick dealers met and a majority voted to recommend closing Saturdays, year-round, effective December 1, 1973. (CX 824B.)

48. On November 12th, the Chevrolet dealers, by consensus, agreed that member-dealerships close on Saturdays beginning December 1, 1973. (CX 344.)

49. On November 13, 1973, the Dodge dealers voted to announce the closing of their dealership on Saturdays, effective December 1, 1973, in the media. (CX 622B.)

50. On November 15, 1973, the Buick dealers agreed to close on Saturdays, effective December 1, 1973. (CX 825.) On November 19th, the Oldsmobile dealers agreed to close on Saturdays, year-round, effective December 1, 1973. (CX 1116B.) By November 30th, the Detroit Metropolitan Ford Dealers had agreed to close on Saturdays beginning December 1, 1973. (CX 3358.) By December 1st, the Lincoln-Mercury dealers had also agreed to close their showrooms on Saturdays. (CX 3353.) The Chrysler-Plymouth dealers agreed to close Saturdays on a permanent basis on December 1, 1973. (J Thompson Tr. 1966-67.)

#### 6. Effectiveness of Agreement

51. Of 231 new car dealerships in the Detroit area, eight have regular Saturday hours year-round. They are all franchised by foreign manufacturers. (JX 2.)

52. Seven of 231 new car dealerships in the Detroit area remain open after 6:30 p.m. for three or more nights per week. (JX 2.) In the communities around the Detroit area, 31 of 107 new car dealerships (29%) remain open for evening sales hours for three or more nights. (CX 3700, CX 4002F.)

#### 7. Other Cities

53. Detroit is the only metropolitan area in the United States in

which almost all new car dealerships are closed on Saturdays. (Gibbs Tr. 633-35; Beauchamp Tr. 679-80; CX 6111M.)

54. In the communities immediately surrounding the Detroit area, 88 out of 107 new car dealerships (82%) are open on Saturdays. (CX 3700, CX 4002A, CX 3819; Genthe Tr. 56-57.) In the Cincinnati area, all 135 new car dealerships are open on **[10]** Saturdays. (CX 3701, CX 4002B.) In the St. Louis area, 159 out of the 161 new car dealerships (99%) are open on Saturdays. (CX 3703, CX 4002C.) In the Chicago area, all 364 new car dealerships are open on Saturdays. (CX 3704, CX 4002E.) In the Cleveland area, all 168 new car dealerships are open on Saturdays. (CX 3702, CX 4002D.)

55. In the Cincinnati area, 112 out of 135 new car dealerships (83%) stay open three or more nights. (CX 3701, CX 4002G.) In the St. Louis area, 143 out of 161 new car dealerships (89%) stay open three or more nights. (CX 3703, CX 4002H.) In the Chicago area, 354 out of 364 new car dealerships (97%) remain open three or more nights. (CX 3704, CX 4002J.)

56. In the Cleveland area, three out of 168 new car dealerships (2%) are open three or more nights. (CX 3702, CX 4002I.) However, the limited evenings hours in Cleveland may be the result of collusion. (RX 3A, RX 984.)

#### *D. Business Effect of Closings*

57. On October 5, 1961, DADA urged dealers to resume closing their dealerships at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, Friday and Saturday evenings after they were open for one week to sell new models. Reasons cited for resuming the evening closings were that they "improve employee morale, cut down shopping, and enable dealers to reduce certain expenses." (CX 134.)

58. In October 1962, DADA again urged dealers to resume closings because the majority of dealers participated in it and "They like it because it improves employee morale [and] cuts down on shopping . . . ." (CX 140.)

59. In a May 14, 1965 letter, the DADA Executive Vice President wrote to nonconforming dealers urging them to close on Wednesday, Friday and Saturday evenings. He stated that the closings improved employee morale, reduced costs, and minimized shopping by prospective buyers. (CX 166.)

60. A 1966 letter from the DADA Executive Vice President to a dealer explained that the joint closing program is intended to benefit

the dealers by reducing shopping time afforded to consumers, thereby preventing consumers from bargaining down the prices of motor vehicles. CX 171:

Our association has worked on this evening closing project for several years, to a point where practically all new car dealers are closed three evenings a week. This [11] situation has proven popular, not only with the dealership employees, but with the dealers themselves. They have found that they have been able to somewhat reduce their costs, and more importantly they have improved their grosses. This has been brought about by the fact that with fewer shopping hours, the public can devote less time to shopping, and consequently forcing down prices.

61. In May, 1983, respondent Charles P. Audette, President of the Metro Detroit Cadillac Dealers Association, sent a memorandum to the members of the Association about sales activities at dealerships on Saturdays. Mr. Audette wrote that:

Saturday closing began as a method of discouraging the Unionizing of salesmen. It has been successful in accomplishing this and the dealers experienced no drop in volume when they were operating for 5 instead of 6 days. In fact, grosses actually went up . . . . Our association is pledged to back a dealer who takes a labor strike, when he is the one who is right and is not provoking the strike. (CX 101, CX 909A.)

### *E. History Of Dealership Closings*

#### *1. Union Background*

##### *a. Detroit's Union History*

62. The growth of union power in Detroit began with the formation of the United Auto Workers ("UAW") in 1935. (Babson Tr. 1144.) Within two years, the union movement became a powerful force in Detroit. (Babson Tr. 1147-48.) Since then, the unions have represented a major economic and political power in Detroit. (Babson Tr. 1148.)

63. Led by the UAW, unions became more militant in the 1930s. There were numerous strikes, especially in the automobile manufacturing industry. (Babson Tr. 1144.)

64. The UAW in 1936 pioneered the sit-down strike. (Babson Tr. 1144-45.) In a sit-down strike, the strikers occupy the employer's premises and prevent the employer from maintaining production for the duration of the strike. [12] (Babson Tr. 1144-45.) Sit-down strikes are illegal. *NLRB v. Fansteel Metallurgical Corp.*, 306 U.S. 240 (1939).

65. In 1937, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauff-

feurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America ("Teamsters") began to assert its power in Detroit. The Teamsters had fewer than 1,000 members in Detroit in 1937; by 1950, it had 20,000. (Babson Tr. 1154.)

66. The Teamsters negotiated multi-employer bargaining agreements among groups of trucking businesses. Some of their contracts encompassed hundreds of employers. Pursuant to these contracts, wages, hours and working conditions were uniform across entire industries. (Babson Tr. 1154.)

67. The Teamsters expanded to include warehouses, breweries, bottlers, bakeries, bookbinders and other businesses that required trucking services. (Babson Tr. 1154-55.)

68. In the late 1930s and 1940s, the Teamsters had a reputation for being extremely difficult in its organizational methods, and for using threats, coercion, and intimidation. (Colombo Tr. 1689.) Small businesses were especially apprehensive about having their employees organized by the Teamsters. (Babson Tr. 1155.)

69. There are two closely related concepts that appear in the union efforts to organize the employees at the automobile dealers in the Detroit area. These concepts are uniformity of working conditions and multi-employer bargaining.

70. Unions want employers to provide their employees with the same wages, hours and working conditions as are provided throughout the industry. (Babson Tr. 1148-49.) A lack of uniformity in wages, hours and working conditions destabilizes the workplace and tends to decrease wages until uniformity is reached at the lower level. (Babson Tr. 1164.) The demand for uniformity was the main focus of the early union activities in Detroit. (Babson Tr. 1149; Somerville Tr. 3733.)

71. The most effective way for unions to achieve uniform working conditions is through multi-employer bargaining. It is the best vehicle a union can use to obtain uniform working conditions. (Stringari Tr. 1530.) Multi-employer bargaining is an important goal of many unions, because it makes it easier for the union to organize workers, and improves the union's power in bargaining. (Babson Tr. 1164.)

72. A union that is a party to a multi-employer bargaining agreement can, if it chooses, strike the entire industry at the same time, with devastating impact. (Stringari Tr. 1559; Colombo Tr. 1702; Somerville Tr. 3736.) [13]

73. Or, in the same situation, a union can engage in whipsaw

strikes, closing one employer while collecting dues from the non-striking employees to finance the strike. Once that dealer capitulates, the resulting contract sets a standard which is then imposed on the next dealer to be struck, and so on. (Burwell Tr. 2093-94.)

74. One way by which the line groups resisted the union's tactic of whipsaw strikes was to develop strike funds. (Stringari Tr. 1566-67.) The dealers would use the strike fund to help the struck dealer weather the strike. If the first dealer does not capitulate, the whipsaw is broken. (Burwell Tr. 2144-45.) The strike funds would not have been sufficient to defend a line group against a strike pursuant to a multi-employer bargaining agreement. (Burwell Tr. 2148.)

75. The various unions that were active in Detroit-area automobile dealerships consistently sought multi-employer bargaining. (Colombo Tr. 1712-13; Stringari Tr. 1324.)

## 2. First Efforts to Unionize Dealerships

76. Both the UAW and the Teamsters turned their attention to Detroit-area automobile dealers in the 1940s. Just prior to World War II, the sales departments of several Ford and Lincoln-Mercury dealers in the Detroit area were unionized by the Teamsters. (Stringari Tr. 1520.)

77. In 1945, the Teamsters sought to negotiate a complete multi-employer contract with the Ford and Lincoln-Mercury dealers. (Stringari Tr. 1520.) The dealers resisted multi-employer bargaining, and no contract was signed. (Stringari Tr. 1521.)

78. As the Teamsters concentrated on the "front end" of the dealerships (the sales department), the UAW approached the "back end" (the service department). UAW Local 415 had organized a number of service departments prior to the War, especially in the Ford, Lincoln-Mercury, Chevrolet and Buick lines. (Stringari Tr. 1514-15.) Each of those lines had entered into multi-employer bargaining with the UAW and each line group had a contract with the UAW covering the dealers in the line. (Stringari Tr. 1515.) Fifty-two Ford dealers had agreed to a multi-employer contract following a two-week strike in 1942. (RX 957.)

79. In 1946, Attorney Arthur Stringari was retained by the Ford dealers to handle their labor relations and to negotiate the contract. (Stringari Tr. 1514.) Attorney Fred Colombo represented many of the General Motors dealers. (Colombo Tr. 1684.) [14]

80. One of the major goals of the UAW was to expand its multiple-

employer bargaining agreement to the dealers that were not yet unionized. (Colombo Tr. 1746, 1710; Stringari Tr. 1519.)

81. After lengthy negotiations, the parties reached an impasse in mid-1947. The UAW went on strike, beginning in August 1947. The strike was lengthy and violent, and it affected the nature of dealer/employee relations for decades. (Stringari Tr. 1516-19.)

82. At the time of the strike, there were seven Chevrolet dealerships where the back end employees were represented by the UAW, and 25 to 27 Chevrolet dealers that were not unionized. (Colombo Tr. 1686-88.) The union demanded that the seven induce the others to join the bargaining unit. (Colombo Tr. 1688.) Mr. Colombo advised the Chevrolet dealers to resist the pressure and reject inclusion in the bargaining unit. (Colombo Tr. 1691.)

83. The union struck two of the largest Chevrolet dealers, Jerry McCarthy Chevy and Ver Hoven Chevy, in order to force them to persuade the other dealers to accede to multi-employer bargaining. (Colombo Tr. 1691-92.)

84. In September 1947, the UAW had a "flying squadron" of several hundred strikers wearing helmets. (RX 945, RX 949, RX 952, RX 961.) They picketed McCarthy Chevy. (Colombo Tr. 1696; RX 952.) The flying squadron also picketed at Ver Hoven Chevy. (RX 949, RX 952.)

85. Violence during the 1947 strike was widespread. (RX 945.) The car of one non-union employee was burned at his home, and dealership windows were shot out. (RX 951.) One dealer, Warren Avis, was threatened that he would be "carried out on a slab." (RX 959.) An employee at Bill Brown Ford had a brick thrown through his window at home. (RX 948.) Windows were also smashed at several dealerships. (RX 950B.) Nineteen union members were arrested following a riot at Floyd Rice Ford. (RX 958.) There was also picketing at Stark Hickey Ford by a "goon squad" and a two and a half hour riot at Northlawn Ford. (RX 959.) The leader of UAW served a jail sentence for assaulting a non-striker, and was forced to resign. (RX 960.)

86. The UAW increased pressure on the struck dealerships. The Teamsters would not cross the picket lines to deliver the cars, thereby denying the struck dealers cars to sell. (Colombo Tr. 1695.)

87. The strike continued at some dealerships until June 1948. (North Tr. 1427; Stringari Tr. 1517; Colombo Tr. 1698.) Following the strike in 1947-1948, the UAW concentrated on unionizing

individual dealers for the next two years. (Colombo Tr. 1762; RX 971.) [15]

88. Dealers who were involved in the 1947 strike were thereafter apprehensive about the prospect of further union disputes. (Wink Tr. 1602.)

89. Having seen the results from the city-wide UAW strike, counsel for the dealers continued to advise the dealers to resist multiple employer bargaining by all legal means. (Stringari Tr. 1527; Colombo Tr. 1701.) The dealers followed this advice. (Stringari Tr. 1528.) Counsel also advised that the dealers could best avoid unionization on a multiple employer basis by presenting a united front to the unions, and by making uniform concessions to their employees. (Stringari Tr. 1528; Colombo Tr. 1703.)

90. Part of the dealers' united front was the creation by the General Motors dealers of a fund to be used to compensate struck dealers for their losses. (Colombo Tr. 1769-70.) Similar funds were later created for the other line groups. (Stringari Tr. 1566.)

91. The dealers also recognized that they would have to make some concessions to their employees. However, they also recognized that concessions could provoke unionization if they were not uniform. (Colombo Tr. 1703; Stringari Tr. 1523.) This advice was repeated and followed over the 40 years following the UAW strike.

### 3. Demand for Shorter Hours

92. In the early 1950s, dealerships typically were open for sales from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday. (Rehn Tr. 2686; W. Lee Tr. 1844; J. Thompson Tr. 1943.)

93. Some dealers were open much longer hours. (Dittrich Tr. 3150; Barnett, CX 3800 at 38-39.)

94. In addition to the posted hours, most dealerships held one or more sales meetings each week, typically beginning a half hour before the dealership opened. (Genthe, Sr. Tr. 2340; W. Lee Tr. 1845.)

95. The salesmen could not always leave work at the posted closing hour. If a salesman was with a customer, he would remain at work for as long as the customer remained in the showroom. (Rehn Tr. 1185; Mason Tr. 2155.)

96. In many instances, the salesmen were required by the dealer to work the full time the dealership was open. (Rehn Tr. 1185; Charnock Tr. 2686; Roscoe Tr. 1386.) At these dealerships, the work week was at least 69 hours. (Bretzlaff Tr. 1252; Mason Tr. 2157.) [16]

97. At other dealerships, the salesmen were not required by the dealer to be at work the full time the dealership was open. (W. Lee Tr. 1844; RX 3442B.)

98. Car salesmen have always been paid by commission. The commission is a percentage of the gross profit of the car (a percentage of the difference between the cost of the car and its sales price). (Rehn Tr. 1186.) Many dealers do not pay a commission on a "pack" (the cost of selling the car). (Thibodeau Tr. 2555.) In calculating the commission, the salesman is paid a percentage of the excess over cost plus pack for which the car is sold. (Carnahan Tr. 2239-40.)

99. There is pressure for a salesman to be present whenever the dealership is open, lest he miss an opportunity to make a sale. (Dittrich Tr. 3150-52; Charlebois Tr. 2208-09, 2212-13; Carnahan Tr. 2221; Bretzlaff Tr. 1258; Rehn Tr. 1192-93; W. Lee Tr. 1844-45.)

100. One of the pressures that forced salesmen to be present in the dealership whenever it was open is referred to as "skating." Skating is stealing someone else's customer. (Roscoe Tr. 1389.) A customer is skated if after negotiating with one salesman he returns to the dealership on a different day and the deal is closed by a different salesman. The closing salesman often takes the full commission. The original salesman, who may have spent several hours with the customer, receives no compensation. Skating is much more likely if the salesman is not on the sales floor when the customer returns, and this is one factor that led salesmen to be present whenever the dealership was open for business. (Roshak tr. 2451.) Skating was such a problem that salesmen had fist fights over entitlements to commissions. (CX 3835 at 53-54; Dittrich Tr. 3189-90.)

101. During the 1950s, although many dealerships had shifts, most salesmen felt they had to be at the dealership during the showroom hours in order to protect themselves against skating *i.e.*, losing a returning customer and sale to a fellow salesman. As a result, salesmen frequently complained about the length of the workweek. (RX 3442B-C; Roscoe Tr. 1387; Dittrich Tr. 3154.)

102. Because of the pressure to be present whenever the dealership was open, a salesman's work week was controlled by the dealership's hours of operation. (Roscoe Tr. 1388-89; Bretzlaff Tr. 1259-60; Mason Tr. 2159-60; Genthe, Sr. Tr. 2342-44; Ryan Tr. 2674-75.)

103. A salesman whose dealership is closed risks the loss of a commission if other dealerships are open. (Bretzlaff Tr. 1260-61; Roscoe Tr. 1389; W. Lee Tr. 1848-49.) [17]



104. During the 1950s, salesmen demanded shorter hours of operation on a uniform basis throughout the Detroit area. (Tennyson Tr. 1795-96; J. Thompson Tr. 1945-46.)

#### 4. Teamsters Campaign in 1954

105. Teamsters Local 376 launched a major campaign to unionize the salesmen in early 1954. The campaign initially focused on the Ford and Chevy dealers. The leaders of the Teamsters effort were Jimmy Hoffa and Henry Lower. (RX 971.)

106. By the time the campaign was publicly announced, 400 salesmen had already become members of the union. (RX 971.) Two weeks later, 1231 salesmen had signed up, and 750 salesmen attended a Teamsters organizational meeting. (RX 972, RX 974.) Ultimately, the Teamsters claimed 2700 members. (RX 802.)

107. In April 1954, the Teamsters demanded higher commissions. Another key demand was for a uniform shorter work week. (RX 980, RX 981B, RX 972.)

108. The Teamsters' immediate demand was for a uniform shortening of hours. The salesmen's ultimate goal at that time was for a normal five-day work week. (Bretzlaff Tr. 1257; Stringari Tr. 1533-34.)

109. The Teamsters also sought multi-employee bargaining, and counsel again advised the dealers not to accede to this demand. (Colombo Tr. 1700-02.)

110. At the first organizational meeting, Teamsters threatened blocking of cars to dealerships. (RX 973B, RX 975, RX 976, RX 801A.)

111. Where there was no multi-employer bargaining, dealers could resist the threat to block deliveries by having cars delivered to non-struck dealers. In the case of a multi-employer strike, there would be no such safe havens, and the union could shut down the entire city. (Colombo Tr. 1701, 1747.)

112. The union struck several dealerships in late 1954. (RX 802.)

113. The Teamsters' effort was hindered because the National Labor Relations Board refused to take jurisdiction over Detroit dealerships unless they made interstate purchases of \$1 million or interstate sales of \$100,000. (RX 800, RX 801B.) The union withdrew many of its election petitions following a tightening of NLRB jurisdiction, and was defeated in most of the remaining elections. (RX 800, RX 803.) By December 1954, its efforts were limited to trying to organize the Ford dealers. (RX 803.) [18]

114. Following the 1954 effort to organize the salesmen, the Teamsters shifted emphasis to the mechanics. (Stringari Tr. 1567; RX 804.)

115. The effort to organize mechanics in 1954 led to strikes, intimidation, and violence. Robert Sellers described a two-month strike at his father's dealership in 1954. The strike was organized by the Teamsters who were then representing, or trying to organize, the mechanics. CX 3857 at 64-66:

And the phone would ring at night, and there'd be nobody there. Just somebody breathing on the phone. We had to delist our phone number.

If the Teamsters were sitting out in front of the house, we'd have to draw the drapes and I'd tell the children to get to the back of the house. It was a terrible thing.

\* \* \* \* \*

Jimmy Hoffa lived a block and a half from the dealership. Oh, we had some nice company down there. Johnny Kinghorn was a real handsome fellow that worked for us; was our service manager, real fine guy. They beat the tar out of him and knocked his teeth out. Johnny never went back into the car business. Got right out.

#### 5. 1959-1961 Union Campaigns

116. In 1959, dealers were typically open from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. during the week, and from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays. (W. Lee Tr. 1852; Genthe, Sr. Tr. 2340.)

117. At some dealerships, the salesmen worked longer than the usual 69 hours (plus sales meetings and late customers). (Ryan Tr. 2651 (8:00 a.m. to 10:30 p.m. six days a week); Dittrich Tr. 3154 (80-85 hours a week).)

118. The salesmen continued to complain to management about the long work weeks. (Roscoe Tr. 1392; Bretzlaff Tr. 1256; Dittrich Tr. 3154.)

119. As had been the case in 1954, the salesmen's immediate goal in 1959 was a uniform shortening of the work week, and their long-range goal was a normal five-day work week. (Mason Tr. 2158; North Tr. 1436; Roshak Tr. 2453.) **[19]**

120. Most salesmen felt that the problem with the excessive length of the work week could not be corrected by splitting shifts or otherwise giving salesmen time off while the dealership was open, and to do so would reduce the salesmen's wages. The salesmen therefore resisted split shifts where the dealers suggested it. (North Tr. 1436-37; McIntyre Tr. 1990.)

121. Even where split shifts were tried, the salesmen usually

worked the full time the dealership was open, lest they lose commission through skating or by not being available when their customer came to the store. (W. Lee Tr. 1952; RX 3444B.)

122. The salesmen in 1959 demanded uniform shorter hours of operation for all dealerships throughout the metropolitan area. (Ryan Tr. 2656-59; McIntyre Tr. 1989; Bretzlaff Tr. 1259-61; Roshak Tr. 2453; Mason Tr. 2158-60; North Tr. 1440.)

123. The efforts by the salesmen to convince management to shorten the hours of operation of the dealerships were unsuccessful. (W. Lee Tr. 1849.) The salesmen therefore turned again to the union.

124. The Teamsters had continued to organize the salesmen after the 1954 campaign, but without much success until an election among the salesmen at the three Cadillac factory branches in April 1959. (RX 804.) The election marked the beginning of a major Teamsters effort to unionize the salesmen in the Detroit area.

125. One factor that led to the resurgence of the Teamsters in 1959 was that the NLRB expanded its jurisdiction in October 1958. (RX 804.)

126. The 1959 organizing campaign was headed by Edward Petroff, Sr. (RX 804.) Multi-employer bargaining was the Teamsters' goal throughout the 1959-1961 organizing effort. (RX 805C.)

127. Petroff's city-wide effort resulted in the filing of petitions for elections among salesmen at about 150 dealerships. (RX 807B.)

128. During the Teamsters campaign, a new union appeared. The Salesmen's Guild of America ("Guild") began to unionize salesmen in June 1960. (RX 807B.) In September, the Guild filed election petitions at 20 dealerships. (RX 805C.) The Guild, like the Teamsters, intended to proceed through multi-employer bargaining. (RX 805F.)

129. The two unions made similar demands. (RX 3441B, RX 3444C.) The Guild demanded shorter work weeks, and wanted higher commissions and other benefits. (RX 806B.) The guild's proposed contract in September 1960 would limit the salesmen's [20] work week to five days, although the dealership would remain open six days a week from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. (RX 805D.)

130. In 1959 and 1960, the Teamsters also sought uniform five-day work weeks, higher commissions and other benefits. (Tennyson Tr. 1790-91; RX 700, RX 701.)

131. Both unions demanded "that all Detroit area dealerships conform to the same reduced showroom hours." (RX 3441B.) The uniformity was necessary so that the salesmen would not risk the loss

of commissions to salesmen at dealerships with longer hours. (RX 3441B-C; RX 3444C; Ryan Tr. 2656-59.)

132. Although the unions were active only at some of the dealerships, all dealers were concerned with the union threat. The dealers had been advised that union successes tend to lead to more union victories at other dealerships. (Colombo Tr. 1708-09; W. Lee Tr. 1854-55; Genthe, Sr. Tr. 2347-48.)

133. Success at some dealerships could also be exploited by the union to lead to multi-employer bargaining, a process that counsel recommended against. (Colombo Tr. 1710; Stringari Tr. 1532-33.)

134. The Chrysler dealers established a fund to be used to pay the legal fees of any dealer with labor problems. (RX 308.) The Ford and Lincoln-Mercury dealers also established strike funds. (RX 338.)

135. In 1959-1961, the unions demanded uniformity. (Colombo Tr. 1707; JX 6B.) Because employees could legally demand uniformity in wages, hours and working conditions, and because lack of uniformity often leads to industry-wide unionization, the dealers conceded to their employees' demand for uniformity. (Stringari Tr. 1528-29; Colombo Tr. 1708.)

136. The dealers discussed the demands at the line group meetings. (J. Thompson Tr. 1943-44; W. Lee Tr. 1856-57.) In September 1960, the line groups recommended minimum employment standards designed to match most of the demands announced by the two unions. (RX 807C.) The Lincoln-Mercury dealers instituted a wide range of uniform concessions: paid vacations, partial payment of hospitalization and life insurance, lower cost demos, limits on house deals and a higher monthly draw. They also gave their employees a shorter work week, including closing at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday and Saturday, and a 44 hour week. (RX 806C.)

137. In September 1960, the Chevy dealers closed their showrooms at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday and Saturday nights, and began providing a minimum commission of \$50 per sale. (RX 805F-G.) They also began providing paid vacations, and paying 50% of the cost of health, accident and welfare insurance. (RX 806D.) [21]

138. In September 1960, the Ford dealers made similar concessions: early closings on Wednesday and Saturday, paid vacations, \$50 minimum commission, \$100 weekly draw and a demo plan. (RX 806C-D.)

139. In September 1960, the Chrysler dealers also closed early on Wednesday and Saturday nights in response to the union demands. (RX 806E.)

140. Don McIntyre reduced his hours at Superior Oldsmobile because making that concession uniformly with other dealers would lessen the risk of unionization. (McIntyre Tr. 1993.) Barnett Pontiac began closing because it "was having severe labor problems at that time, a lot of pressures." (CX 3800 at 40.)

141. Other respondent dealers reduced their hours in 1960 to respond to demands by employees for uniform reduction of hours of operation and to obtain labor peace and stable labor relations and to avoid unionization. (JX 6B.)

142. In 1960, each of the respondent associations recommended to its members that they make certain uniform reductions in showroom hours of operation in response to demands for such uniformity of employees and their representatives. In certain instances, an association advised its members of the effective dates for the recommended hours reductions. (JX 8B-C.)

143. The salesmen continued to complain about the hours and many dealers responded within a few months by closing early on Friday evenings. (Roscoe Tr. 1392-93; Mason Tr. 2163-64; JX 8B-C.)

144. By giving in on the hours issue, many of the dealers hoped to avoid being unionized. They felt that the salesmen were more interested in improvements in working conditions than in the union. (Genthe, Sr. Tr. 2342, 2346-48; Wink Tr. 1620; Tennyson Tr. 1800-02.)

145. The strategy of uniform concessions was successful. By December 1960, the Guild won only two of its first thirteen elections, and the Teamsters lost 18 of 19 elections. (RX 808, RX 809.)

146. The Salesmen's Guild made an effort in 1962 to organize salesmen. It filed another four election petitions in 1962, but was defeated in all four elections. Both the Teamsters and the Guild ceased organizational activities. (RX 812.)

147. The few dealers that had not closed on Friday nights in 1961 faced continued pressure from their salesmen, and ultimately closed. (North Tr. 1454.) In 1962, the salesmen at John McAuliffe Ford went on strike. The principal issue in the strike was the length of the work week. (Bretzlaff Tr. 1267.) [22]

148. The recalcitrant dealers were pressured by the Teamsters to shorten their hours. Ed Schmid purchased a Ford dealership in 1961 or 1962. (Schmid Tr. 1891.) The Teamsters and his salesmen pressured him to close in the evening during the early 1960s. (Schmid Tr. 1894.) Spitler-Demmer Ford was still open on Friday evenings in

1963, though most other dealers had closed. The dealership was subjected to continuing pressure by its salesmen, and ultimately closed on Friday at 6:00. (Demmer Tr. 2571-72.)

149. Salesmen protested the length of the work week through the 1962-1966 period, seeking further reductions. (Roshak Tr. 2460; Charnock Tr. 2691-92.)

150. The dealers understood that the salesmen's dissatisfaction could erupt into another union organizing campaign. The union was always there, and was always a threat, even when it was not actively organizing the salesmen. (W. Lee Tr. 1858; CX 411B; RX 813.)

#### 6. Automotive Salesmen Association

151. Despite the advances in the early 1960s, the salesmen still faced the problem of lengthy work weeks. This led to the formation of a new union, the Automotive Salesmen Association ("ASA").

152. The ASA was created by Tim Mulroy, an employee at Jim Davis Chevrolet, and it began recruiting in February or March 1966. (Carnahan Tr. 2215, 2219.) The two issues that primarily motivated Mulroy to form a union of salesmen were "to close on Saturdays" and to increase pay. (Carnahan Tr. 2215.) Mr. Carnahan, who was one of the first recruiters for the ASA, became involved for the primary reason of shortening the work week by closing the dealerships on Saturdays. (Carnahan Tr. 2219.)

153. Primary among the ASA's objectives was the demand for a shorter work week. (Roscoe Tr. 1395; North Tr. 1456-57; Wink Tr. 1624.) The union's immediate goal was for dealerships to close all five evenings and in the early afternoon on Saturdays. (RX 712A; W. Lee Tr. 1882; RX 2958C.) Its long range demand was for dealerships to close all day on Saturdays. (Demmer Tr. 2576.) The literature passed out by the ASA organizers emphasized the goal of shortening the work week by closing in the evenings and Saturday. (RX 753B, RX 720, RX 717B.)

154. The sales employees representing ASA presented their grievances about hours to the dealers. (Roscoe Tr. 1395; Demmer Tr. 2578.) [23]

155. One of the reasons the dealers were so concerned with the prospect of being unionized is that they knew what the result of unionization had been in San Francisco. The unionized sales force in San Francisco obtained such high commissions that the unionized dealers were no longer competitive with the non-unionized dealers in

the surrounding communities. Many of the San Francisco dealers were forced out of business. The Detroit dealers wanted to avoid the same result. (Sellers, CX 3857 at 56-57.)

156. Many salesmen joined the union specifically to achieve shorter work weeks. (Mason Tr. 2166; Carnahan Tr. 2219; deFrancis, CX 3811 at 15.) The ASA rapidly gained adherents. Over 1200 salesmen attended ASA meetings. (CX 3525E.) By early October 1966, 202 petitions had been filed at about 80% of the dealers in the Detroit area. (CX 27; RX 832A.) About 2,000 salesmen became members. (RX 341N.)

*a. Multi-Employer Bargaining*

157. As had been the case in 1947, 1954 and 1959-1961, the ASA demanded that the dealers form a city-wide multi-employer bargaining unit. (RX 832B.) Multi-employer bargaining was a "constant" demand of the ASA. (Burwell Tr. 2092.) The dealers maintained the same position as they had taken with respect to the previous demands for multi-employer bargaining: it would create powerful union, by increasing its financial resources and by strengthening its bargaining ability. Counsel advised the dealers to refuse multi-employer bargaining. (Burwell Tr. 2093.)

*b. Dealer Concessions*

158. The Chrysler-Plymouth dealers recognized that uniformity in hours would be the key to avoiding unionization. (Burwell Tr. 2083.)

159. The same strategy was followed by the Ford dealers. (Demmer Tr. 2575-77.)

160. Less than two weeks after the ASA was formally incorporated, the board of directors of the Chevrolet Association recommended that the Chevrolet dealers close Tuesday evenings, in addition to the three evenings already closed. (CX 306A-B.) At a meeting of the Association, the Chevrolet dealers noted and agreed, and began closing at 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, July 18, 1966. (CX 307B, CX 309B; Wink Tr. 1622.)

161. The other line groups also closed on Tuesdays at approximately the same time as the Chevrolet dealers. [24] (North Tr. 1455 (Ford); W. Lee Tr. 1859 (Oldsmobile); J. Thompson Tr. 1956 (Chrysler-Plymouth); Roshak Tr. 2462 (Dodge); Armstrong Tr. 3051 (Buick); Dreisbach Tr. 3342 (Cadillac); Melton Tr. 3608 (Volkswagen).)

162. The direct causes of the closing on Tuesday evenings were the

demands of salesmen for the uniform shorter work weeks and the fear that failure to make that concession would lead to widespread unionization. (Morris, CX 3845 at 56; North Tr. 1455-56; Wink Tr. 1622; J. Thompson Tr. 1956; McIntyre Tr. 2002.)

*c. ASA Strikes and Violence*

163. During the organization campaign in the summer and fall of 1966, salesmen at several dealerships went out on strike. One of the first strikes was at Frank Chevrolet, formerly Jim Davis Chevrolet. (RX 818, RX 722J, RX 830A.)

164. There was violence associated with the ASA campaign in 1966. Some of the violence was directed at the dealers, as when Wink Chevrolet suffered broken windows and slashed tires. (Wink Tr. 1637; RX 605.) Violence was also directed at strikebreakers. (CX 3525E; RX 762, RX 833B.)

*d. Elections*

165. A few elections were held in September and October 1966. (RX 24) The NLRB ordered that elections would be held on December 6, 7 and 8, 1966. The election was a success for the ASA. (Stringari Tr. 1540.) Employees voted in favor of the union at 61 dealerships. (RX 834, RX 822.)

166. The ASA continued its organizing activities after the elections in December 1966, and won additional elections in 1967. (Schmid Tr. 1913-14.) The union won 81 elections. (RX 821G.)

*e. Contract Negotiations*

167. Following the elections in late 1966 and early 1967, the organized dealerships began formal collective bargaining with the ASA. (Schmid Tr. 1924-25; Babson Tr. 1150-51.)

168. The parties often negotiated the ASA's demand for an end to Saturday work. There also was negotiation of closing on Saturday while extending evening hours. (Burwell Tr. 2098-99; Demmer Tr. 2578-79.) [25]

169. In the first round of negotiations in 1967, the dealers did not accede to the union's demand that the dealers close on Saturdays. (Burwell Tr. 2099.) Nonetheless, numerous contracts were signed in 1967 and 1968. (CX 3604, CX 3605, CX 3606, CX 3608, CX 3609, CX 3610, CX 3612, CX 3613, CX 3614, CX 3615.)



## 7. Saturday Summer Closings

170. Following the widespread closing of dealerships on Tuesday evenings in 1966, the typical work for salesmen was 60 hours, consisting of two days of work from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. and four days of 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., plus whatever time was spent in sales meetings before the dealership opened, and in sales efforts that concluded after normal closing hours. By contrast, the typical work week for other occupations in Detroit and around the country was 40 hours. (Schmid Tr. 1910-11; Rehn Tr. 1191; W. Lee Tr. 1859; McInerney, CX 3835 at 43; Mielnicki, CX 3842 at 50.)

171. The salesmen still were not satisfied with the length of the work week, despite the gains they had made. (Charlebois Tr. 2194; Mason Tr. 2167; Ryan Tr. 2670-71.)

172. Some dealerships attempted to resolve the problem of long work weeks by instituting split shifts or some other arrangement that shortened the salesmen's work weeks without shortening the hours of operation of the dealership. The salesmen resisted these efforts. (Ritchie Tr. 1306-07; Tennyson Tr. 1828; Carnahan Tr. 2220-21.)

173. The salesmen demanded that all dealers close uniformly on Saturdays. (Thomson Tr. 2032-33; Rehn Tr. 1211; Ritchie Tr. 1309.) The dealers agreed to close. (Schmid Tr. 1911, 1914, 1921; Wink Tr. 1624; Carnahan Tr. 2224, 2228-29.)

174. After the elections in 1966, the ASA began formal negotiations with the dealerships where the union had prevailed. The union typically tried to negotiate a uniform reduction in hours. (Demmer Tr. 2578; North Tr. 1457; Carrick Tr. 2979-81.)

175. Although some negotiations were carried out between the ASA and individual dealers, the ASA still sought a single city-wide contract that would cover all dealers, or secondarily, multiple employer contracts for each of the line groups. (Stringari Tr. 1540-41; Sellers Tr. 2779-80.)

176. The ASA in August 1967 made another attempt to meet with DADA, and DADA again refused to take any action that could result in its recognition as a multi-employer representative. (RX 31.) The ASA also attempted to negotiate with the line group [26] associations. (RX 724G.) The line groups rejected such group negotiations. (RX 724G.) DADA noted that it was not authorized to negotiate as an multi-employer bargaining representative, and forwarded the petitions to the individual dealers. (RX 33A.)

177. In June 1969, the ASA sponsored a rally to voice opposition to

Saturday work. (RX 735.) Three days after the rally, the union demonstrated in front of DADA headquarters, demanding an end to Saturday work. (RX 847; CX 3811 at 33.) The salesmen threatened to picket dealerships that refused to close. (RX 847.)

178. The dealers understood the dangers of multi-employer bargaining and wanted to avoid it, as they had successfully avoided it during the previous union activity. (Schmid Tr. 1924; Ritchie Tr. 1323-25; Roshak Tr. 2464.)

179. The ASA developed a form contract for each line group and attempted to impose that contract on each unionized dealer within the line group. The ASA threatened a strike of salesmen in February 1967. (RX 822, RX 841, RX 723.)

180. While the ASA was threatening its city-wide strike, a new union appeared. The Automotive Technicians Association ("ATA") sought to unionize the back ends, *i.e.*, service department employees. (RX 3310.) The ATA later affiliated with the International Association of Machinists. (RX 836D, RX 3311.) It pledged to support the threatened salesmen's strike. (RX 841.) ATA demanded the end of weekend work for mechanics. (RX 723D.)

181. The International Association of Machinists organized the service departments, and won 23 representation elections by January 1969. (RX 344K, RX 349H, RX 250B.)

182. In February 1967, DADA responded to the ASA threat of a strike by recommending that dealers close on Tuesday evenings, and stay open late only on Mondays and Thursdays. (CX 173; CX 84A-B, CX 41.)

183. ASA demanded a multi-employer contract. The dealers refused multi-employer bargaining. (RX 821C.)

184. Salesmen at 61 dealerships went on strike on March 1, 1967. The strike lasted five days. (RX 836; Carnahan Tr. 2224-25; Bodick Tr. 2305-06; Steiner Tr. 2271-73.)

185. The city-wide strike was followed by personnel changes within the ASA. The leaders of the ASA resigned. (RX 823.) They were replaced by Carl Van Zant. (RX 824.) In October 1967, the ASA became affiliated with the Seafarers International Union of North America ("SIUNA" or "Seafarers"). (RX 725, RX 842; RX 341K.)  
[27]

186. Other strikes followed the March 1967 city-wide strike. These strikes involved violence, threats of violence, and vandalism. (Mason Tr. 2170-72; CX 3810 at 49.) At Genthe Motor Sales, the two issues

that led to the strike were shorter work weeks and minimum commissions. (Genthe, Sr. Tr. 2358.)

187. Ed Schmid Ford underwent a four and a half month strike by its salesmen in 1968. (Schmid Tr. 1915.) The ASA demanded elimination of all Saturday and night work. (Schmid Tr. 1914; CX 3855 at 43-44.) The dealership and the dealer were subjected to vandalism and threats. (Schmid Tr. 1916-17; RX 843.)

188. In February 1968 at Jack Demmer Ford, the salesmen went out on strike for ten and a half months. (Demmer Tr. 2580.) The ASA/Seafarers were found to have committed unfair labor practices during the strike, including threatening non-strikers with loss of employment and physical harm, assaulting employees, and threatening customers. (RX 612; RX 2718.)

189. There was a series of ASA strikes at Barnett Pontiac that led the dealer to shorten its hours. Mr. Barnett described the strikes, the threats, the issues and the outcome. CX 3800 at 59-60:

In approximately 1967 I had a labor strike by an association called the Automobile Association—Automobile Salesmen Association, ASA. They all walked out, picketed and threatened to blow up my house, threatened my children, threatened my wife. This got to a point where they walked out on strike three or four times.

\* \* \* \* \*

That is when they said, "We're not going to work the long hours. We don't want any more salesmen coming in here. We can cover the floor but we do not want to work the 70, 80 hours a weeks."

I said, "Hey, fellows, if that's what it takes, that's what I'll do."

190. During 1967-1968, there were strikes at Grissom Chevrolet, Berry Pontiac, Hassinger Chevrolet, Flannery Ford, Al Long Ford, Roney Dodge, Clark VW, Pioneer Oldsmobile and other dealerships. (RX 728C, RX 342A, RX2836, RX 2837.) The strike at Hassinger Chevrolet lasted from January to April 1968. (RX 3321A.) The strike at Berry Pontiac lasted for 22 weeks. [28] (RX 3321B.) There was a two week strike of the salesmen at Westborn Chrysler-Plymouth. (RX 3445E.) Among the issues in these strikes were hours of operation of the dealerships. (RX 728B-C, RX 843.)

191. Many of these strikes in 1967-1968 were violent. At Berry Pontiac windows were broken and a private guard was assaulted. (RX 843.) An ASA officer and three employees were indicted in 1968 for having used force, violence and threats to coerce or intimidate ASA members in 1966. (RX 829.) Carl Van Zant, then the president of the ASA, was convicted of assault and battery. (RX 3321B.)

192. At the strike at Al Long Ford, six rifle bullets were fired through the dealership windows. (RX 611C, RX 844.) A picketer was arrested for throwing rocks. (RX 611C.) Another picketer carried an ax on the picket line. An employee who returned to work and one who worked throughout the strike received 15 to 40 telephone calls threatening them with bodily harm if they continued to work. Customers and deliverymen were threatened if they crossed the picket line. The police assigned full-time police protection to the dealership. The FBI reported a bomb threat. (RX 611D.) The NLRB set aside the election due to the union violence and ordered a new election. (RX 611F.)

193. Most dealerships were now closed on four of the six nights, and the question of shorter work weeks focused on Saturdays. (Causley, CX 3805 at 46; RX 733, RX 730A, RX 731A.)

194. During the 1960s, many dealers began closing their service departments on Saturdays. (Sellers Tr. 2790; Glassman Tr. 2932; R. Thompson Tr. 3227.) When the back ends were closed, the salesmen demanded similar treatment. (R. Thompson Tr. 3228; CX 3800 at 60; McInerney, CX 3835 at 42; Sellers, CX 3857 at 38; Tennyson, CX 3860 at 50.)

195. The amount of business transacted on Saturdays declined through the 1960s, especially in the summer. The salesmen became resentful when they were forced to work on Saturdays. (Sellers Tr. 2790-91; Vyletel Tr. 3848.)

196. The dealers discussed the union problem in their line groups. (Ritchie Tr. 1322-23; Wink Tr. 1627; W. Lee Tr. 1860.) Beginning in 1969, many dealers agreed at association meetings to close their showrooms on Saturdays in the summer. (RX 502B; Burwell Tr. 2099-100; Demmer Tr. 2598-99.)

197. The summer closings were intended to satisfy the salesmen, without going to a permanent five day work week. The closing was an effort to respond to the union pressure. (deFrancis, CX 3811 at 18; Roshak Tr. 2472; CX 3853 at 62.)

198. Despite the decline in business on Saturdays in the summer, most dealers preferred to remain open. They closed [29] because of the pressure from the salesmen. (Roscoe Tr. 1396; Schmid Tr. 1926; J. Thompson Tr. 1957.)

#### 8. Saturday Year-Round Closings

199. During the years the dealerships were closed on Saturdays in

the summer, the salesmen remained dissatisfied with the excessive length of the work week for the other nine months of the year. (Mason Tr. 2174; Carnahan Tr. 2229; Charnock Tr. 2702.)

200. By 1973, the salesmen demanded that the dealerships close on Saturdays throughout the year. (Glassman Tr. 2942; Demmer Tr. 2597; Galeana Tr. 2507.)

201. At Greenfield AMC, the salesmen demonstrated their opposition to Saturday work by walking off the job on Saturday. (Keel Tr. 2723-25.)

202. The salesmen at Mulligan Lincoln-Mercury were members of the union. (RX 366B; Krug, CX 3828 at 65.) They struck for 20 weeks in late 1970. (RX 366B.) One of the issues raised by the salesmen was an end to Saturday work. (CX 3828 at 66.) Shortly after the strike, Mulligan closed on Saturdays. (CX 3828 at 67.)

203. The ASA struck Van Dyke Dodge in early 1971. (RX 376F, RX 1275.) During the strike, a customer and his son were beaten by picketers. (RX 1275C.) The strike was "bitter," and lasted for approximately three months. (RX 3441G.)

204. In addition to the ASA/SIUNA, there were other unions that were active in the late 1960s and early 1970s. In 1970, the UAW became involved in trying to organize the salesmen. (RX 230.) The International Union of Operating Engineers also first appeared, and lost a close election among the service employees at Lochmoor Chrysler-Plymouth. (RX 2845B.) Teamsters Local 376 unionized the office workers at Walt Hickey Ford in the late 1960s. (RX 844.)

205. In 1971, the ASA terminated its affiliation with the Seafarers, and became affiliated with Teamsters Local 212. (CX 3529). The Teamsters claimed membership of more than 2,000 of the 2,600 salesmen in the Detroit area. (RX 851.) Teamsters Local 212 later merged with Teamsters Local 376, on March 1, 1974. (RX 747.)

206. The Teamsters made uniform Saturday closings the centerpiece of their organizing effort. (RX 3445H-I.) The president of Local 212 was Carl Van Zant. Shortly after the ASA affiliated with the Teamsters, Van Zant wrote to ASA members and [30] spouses. The letter promised: "Our very first act will be, I promise you, to have your husband home on Saturdays. We will have a 5 day week now!" (RX 745) (Emphasis in original.)

207. The Teamsters' demanded for year-round uniform Saturday closing. Ed Schmid Ford had already had the back end unionized by Teamsters Local 376. (Schmid Tr. 1892.) Mr. Schmid recounted a

meeting with Eddie Petroff, Sr., the business agent for Local 376. Schmid Tr. 1911; RX 763; Schmid Tr. 1922-23: "My favorite Teamsters agent brought me in a sticker and put it on my desk and it says: 'Never on Saturday.' And he said, 'Maybe you would like to have this.' And I said, 'Yeah, thanks.'"

208. The union won four of the first five elections after the ASA affiliated with the Teamsters. One of the union's main demands in the collective bargaining negotiations that followed the election was for year-round Saturday closing. (CX 3829 at 26.)

209. The dealers opposed the Teamsters' demand that they close their showrooms on Saturdays. (Burwell Tr. 2103-04.)

210. The Teamsters organizing campaign was carried out with violence and intimidation. One Cadillac dealer testified that shortly before he closed on Saturdays he was approached by two union organizers who "threatened to burn cars, break out showroom windows." (Massey, CX 3839 at 52.)

211. The ASA/Teamsters planned to picket all dealers not under contract with it, on Saturdays beginning April 10, 1971. The union's objective was "to compel Saturday closings year-round." (RX 378A.)

212. Colonial Dodge was picketed by Teamsters Local 212 on three Saturdays in April 1971. There were 20 or 30 picketers. The picketers blocked the entrance to the dealership, and were "making noise, shouting, slamming doors, slamming on the windows." Customers were intimidated from entering the dealership. (Roshak Tr. 2477.)

213. Sullivan Volkswagen was pressured by salesmen to close on Saturday. The dealership was picketed on a Saturday in May or June 1971. The picketers were salesmen at other Volkswagen dealerships. They blocked traffic and yelled at customers, until the police were called and dispersed the demonstrators. The purpose of the demonstration was to force Sullivan Volkswagen to close on Saturdays. (Sullivan Tr. 500-01.)

214. The salesmen went out on strike at Bob Ford from November 1971 to May 1972. (RX 396E, RX 401B, RX 406C; Somerville Tr. 3723.) One of the major issues was the salesmen's demand for a five day work week. (Somerville Tr. 3724.) The Teamsters vandalized the dealership during the strike. (Somerville Tr. 3754-55.) [31]

215. The Teamsters also struck at Stuart Wilson Ford while the Bob Ford strike was ongoing. (RX 396E, RX 406C.) The demand was for a five day work week. (Somerville Tr. 3727.) The Teamsters engaged in the destruction of property at Stuart Wilson Ford. (Somerville Tr. 3754-55.)

216. During the strike at Stuart Wilson Ford, the teamsters were found to have threatened nonstriking employees with physical harm, assaulted employees, placed nails on the driveway, and physically assaulted customers who attempted to cross the picket line. (RX 619C-D, RX 3403.)

217. The employees at Autobahn Volkswagen went on strike in November 1972. (Carrick Tr. 2982-83.) The strike lasted six months. (RX 410C, RX 3343B.) The unions engaged in intimidation tactics. (Carrick Tr. 2984-89.)

218. The salesmen always coupled the demand for Saturday closing with the demand for uniformity. (Ritchie Tr. 1317; Thomson Tr. 2032; Roscoe Tr. 1404.)

219. In 1970, the year after the ASA demonstrated at DADA to demand Saturday closings, and two years after the salesmen had submitted petitions to DADA, the salesmen again petitioned DADA to get uniform closing on Saturdays. (RX 41A.) Counsel warned that DADA's involvement would inadvertently lead to an obligation to engage in multi-employer bargaining. (Burwell Tr. 2100-03.) The DADA board of directors decided to cease all involvement in the question of Saturday closings. (RX 42C.)

220. The union made one other effort to force DADA to establish Saturday closings throughout the city in September 1971, when the dealers reopened on Saturdays after having been closed during the summer. The salesmen picketed Charnock Oldsmobile. (Charnock Tr. 2702-03.)

221. The picketers at Charnock Oldsmobile blocked the dealership's entrances and prevented customers from entering the premises. (RX 3333.) During the picketing, the dealership was subjected to vandalism. (Charnock Tr. 2706.)

222. On September 11, 1971, the first Saturday after the summer closing, salesmen refused to work at Fischer Buick, Superior Oldsmobile, Rosedale Motors, Bob Ford, Ted Ewald Chevrolet, Simpson Pontiac, Suburban Oldsmobile, Bob Saks Oldsmobile, Tennyson Chevrolet, North Bros. Ford, and Royal Pontiac. (RX 3331.) Many salesmen who reported to work were threatened and intimidated by Teamsters members. (RX 3331.) Later in September, the salesmen went on strike at Simpson Pontiac, Royal Pontiac and Rosedale Oldsmobile. (RX 3333.)

223. The dealers' response to the demands for Saturday closing was affected by their knowledge of what happened to the [32] dealers that

resisted union demands. (W. Lee Tr. 1867; McIntyre Tr. 2005-06; Schmid Tr. 1918-19; Demmer Tr. 2598; Kelel Tr. 2728-29).

224. David Somerville was employed as a salesman at Bob Ford. The main issue that led the salesmen to join the Teamsters was the demand for a five-day work week. (Somerville Tr. 3719.) The union negotiated with Bob Ford for five or six months, but were unable to reach agreement. (Somerville Tr. 3724.) The salesmen went out on strike from November 22, 1971 until April 1972. (Somerville Tr. 3723.)

225. At the beginning of the strike, the picketers were successful in preventing the delivery of new cars to Bob Ford. The car haulers were unionized by the Teamsters, and they would not cross the picket line to deliver cars. (Somerville Tr. 3746-47.)

226. The Teamsters resorted to vandalism to pressure Bob Ford. (Somerville Tr. 3750.) They broke windows, spread nails on the driveway to puncture tires, and scratched customers' cars if they crossed picket lines. They poured acid on new cars, and put super glue in the locks of the cars and the dealership. (Somerville Tr. 3768-71.)

227. The Teamsters began to vandalize other Ford dealers. They destroyed the windows on the whole side of the showroom of Pat Milliken Ford. (Somerville Tr. 3754.) They broke windows at Ray Whitfield Ford. (Somerville Tr. 3768.)

228. The dealers relied on their strike funds to assist the victims of strikes. Distributions were made by the Ford fund to struck dealers, including Bob Ford, Smith Briggs Ford, Al Steiner Ford and Al Long Ford, each of which received from \$12,000 to \$30,000. (RX 338A.)

229. The Teamsters tried to achieve Saturday closings through formal collective bargaining at dealers where the salesmen were represented by the union. One way the Teamsters precluded the dealers from extending their hours was by negotiating a maintenance of standards provision. (Burwell Tr. 2113-23.)

230. A maintenance of standards provision requires the employer to maintain wages, hours and working conditions at the highest minimum standards in effect at the time of the agreement. (Burwell Tr. 2115.) The provision precluded the dealer from extending his hours of operation except for special sales promotions. (Burwell Tr. 2121.)

231. The dealers opposed maintenance of standards provision but were often forced to accept it as part of the negotiated contract. (Burwell Tr. 2123, 2127.) [33]



232. The union demands were discussed at the line group meetings. (Murphy, CX 3846 at 40-41; RX 3441K.) The discussions at the line groups involved the question whether the dealers could achieve labor peace by making additional concessions, and if so, which concession should be made. (Schmid Tr. 1923; Roshak Tr. 2480-81; Duncan Tr. 2424-25.)

233. The problems were also discussed at DADA meetings, until counsel for some of the line groups objected that such discussions might lead to an involuntary multi-employer bargaining obligation. (Ritchie Tr. 1352-53; Genthe, Sr. Tr. 2393; Charnock Tr. 2705-06.)

234. One factor in 1972 for year-round closings on Saturday was that business transacted on Saturday was declining. (Mielnicki, CX 3842 at 56; Norris, CX 3847 at 48-50; Rehn Tr. 1216-18.) It was a good sales day only in the fall when new models were introduced. (CX 3866 at 32.)

235. Some dealers attempted to resolve their salesmen's demand without closing on Saturdays. William Ritchie tried shortening the Saturday hours at Crest Lincoln-Mercury. (Ritchie Tr. 1308.) Mr. North suggested to his salesmen that they close on Monday or Tuesday instead of Saturday. (North Tr. 1437.) Buff Whelan also tried to convince his salesmen to close on Monday instead of Saturday. (CX 3866 at 36.) None of these solutions was acceptable to the salesmen. (*Id.*)

236. Some dealers tried unsuccessfully to resolve their salesmen's complaints about the hours by splitting shifts to give the salesmen some time off. (Levy Tr. 3909-12; Dittrich Tr. 3189-90.)

237. Split shifts involve hiring more salesmen. Hiring more salesmen is opposed because, like split shifts, it divides the same total commissions among more salesmen. (Levy Tr. 3912; RX 739.)

238. The dealers felt that the only way to end union strife was to grant the salesmen what they had demanded: uniform year-round Saturday closings. (Ritchie Tr. 1316-17, 1366; Roscoe Tr. 1398; Roshak Tr. 2480; Thibodeau Tr. 2537; Duncan Tr. 2425.)

239. In some dealerships in 1972, salesmen refused to show up on Saturdays. The sales employees or their union representatives told the dealers they did not want to work on Saturday. The dealers ultimately agreed. (Tennyson Tr. 1814-17; Sellers Tr. 2797-99; Wink Tr. 1626.) Four days after Al Dittrich took over Crestwood Dodge, in October 1973, he and one of his sales employees, the Teamsters Steward Nicola Shelly, had a conversation. She said: "You know we're going to

close Saturdays in a few weeks." He said: "We are?" And she said, "Yes, we are." Mr. Dittrich closed on Saturdays. (Dittrich Tr. 3165-66, 3177.) [34]

240. Faced with the union demands for a uniform five day work week, the threat of violent strikes and diminishing sales on Saturday, the dealers began closing on Saturdays year-round in December 1973. (CX 3346 through CX 3359; Moran, CX 3844 at 27-28, 32-33; Murphy, CX 3846 at 51.)

241. The primary factor leading to the dealers' decision to close was the demands of the salesmen. (deFrancis, CX 3811 at 18; Whitfield, CX 3867 at 48.) The closing was an effort to satisfy the salesmen and settle their grievances so they would not desire to unionize to achieve their goals. (Whitfield, CX 3867 at 47-48.)

242. When most dealerships closed on Saturdays year-round in December 1973, the salesmen had achieved what they had been demanding for nearly 20 years—a uniform five-day work week. The salesmen were satisfied. (Rehn Tr. 1215-16; Bretzlaff Tr. 1277; Roscoe Tr. 1399.) For those dealers that closed, the result was a period of labor peace that has, with some exceptions, lasted to the present. (Armstrong Tr. 3062; Dreisbach Tr. 3351-52.)

243. The Teamsters obtained a maintenance of standards provision at Thompson Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc. in 1973. (Somerville Tr. 3742.) Teamsters Local 387 continued to demand more explicit language banning Saturday hours during collective bargaining negotiations in 1977, 1979 and 1982. (R. Thompson Tr. 3241, 3249, 3251; Bell Tr. 3135.)

244. "Consistent Past Practice" is a rule of labor agreement construction whereby the parties can modify the terms of the collective bargaining agreement by engaging, and acquiescing, in conduct without modifying the agreement in writing. (Burwell Tr. 2129-30.) Genthe Chevrolet, Inc. and Teamsters Local 376 have an understanding that the dealership will be closed on Saturdays and on weekday evenings, other than Mondays and Thursdays, which has become part of the collective bargaining agreement as a result of the dealership's past practice. (Genthe, Jr. Tr. 3319-20.) During the past seven years, Genthe Chevrolet has sought the union's consent to conduct special Saturday sales approximately twice a year. The union has refused to permit the sales employees to participate in roughly half of the special Saturday sales sought by the dealership. (Genthe, Jr. Tr. 3319.)

### 9. Enforcement of Saturday Closings

245. As had occurred numerous times from 1947 through the Saturday closings in 1973, dealerships that were picketed after 1973 often were subject to threats, violence and vandalism. As one Teamsters officials explained, "Those were things that just happened. It was part of the game." (Somerville Tr. 3772.) [35]

246. One of the first dealers that was picketed for remaining open on Saturdays was Bill Brown Ford in 1974. The picketing was organized by the Teamsters. (Bell Tr. 3137; Somerville Tr. 3752.) There were typically from 200 to 400 picketers. His employees were harassed at home. (CX 3802 at 35-37.)

247. Robert Whelan, the dealer at Buff Whelan Chevrolet, disagreed with the other Chevrolet dealerships about the necessity of closing on Saturdays. When the others closed, he remained open. (CX 3866 at 31-32.) "Salesmen from other places" vandalized his cars. (CX 3866 at 32.) He closed. A few years later, he tried to reopen on Saturdays, and again salesmen vandalized his cars. (CX 3866 at 32.) In 1979, he tried to open for a special sale and again had problems. (CX 3866 at 32.)

248. Ray Whitfield's decision to close on Saturdays was made after his salesmen picketed, along with union members and salesmen from other dealers. (CX 3867 at 45, 55.) Some of his cars were vandalized. Windows at the dealership were shot out on consecutive Saturdays. His wife and daughter-in-law received threatening telephone calls at home. (CX 3867 at 45.)

249. Glassman Oldsmobile was also picketed in early 1974. The dealership had closed on Saturdays in 1973, but reopened for a one-time Saturday sale in May 1974. Mr. Glassman informed his salesmen of the upcoming sale on Monday. By the time Mr. Glassman got home Monday evening, his wife had already received telephone calls "threatening her life, my children and my own." (Glassman Tr. 2943-45.)

250. When Glassman Oldsmobile opened on Saturday, the dealership was guarded by two police squad cars and six private security guards. (Glassman Tr. 2947.) There were about 300 salesmen picketing. The picketers carried signs that stated "Never on Saturday." During the picketing, there was damage to the dealership and intimidation of the employees. (Glassman Tr. 2948-54.)

251. The Glassman picketing was organized by the Teamsters.

(Somerville Tr. 3752.) Glassman Oldsmobile has remained closed on Saturdays. (Glassman Tr. 2949.)

252. Key Oldsmobile tried to stay open longer hours in 1974. (CX 3826 at 18.) The dealer, Leo Jerome, was subjected to "harassment, telephone calls, threats, mail, obscene phone calls." (CX 3826 at 19.) In 1974, the dealer restricted his extended hours to evenings and did not then attempt to open on Saturdays. (CX 3826 at 55.)

253. Mr. Jerome's efforts to open longer hours continued until early 1983. He finally gave up after one incident in which 300 salesmen came to his dealership and "totally destroyed" it. CX 3826 at 59: [36]

Every car in the lot was—I mean totally debased, broken windows, burned—headlights kicked out, tail lights kicked out, holes in the sheet metal. . . . Just destroyed, 160 cars, something like that. Every car I had was unsellable.

254. In early 1975, Claborn AMC was forced to shorten its hours after picketing. (RX 854.) Harold Claborn announced in December 1974 that he would open on Saturdays, after which he was "plagued with threatening phone calls. He was picketed by about 200 salesmen, some of whom carried signs stating "Saturday is for the kids." One of Claborn's showroom windows was shattered, after which he capitulated and closed. (CX 3535.)

255. Coons Bros. closed on Saturdays in early 1974 after being pressured by salesmen. (RX 854.) However, it remained open in the evenings. Coons Bros. was picketed and forced to close three evenings because of threats. (RX 854; Bell Tr. 3137.)

256. In 1975 or 1976, Bob Saks Oldsmobile stayed open on Saturday, and was picketed. Some of the picketers at Saks Oldsmobile "keyed"<sup>6</sup> cars and scattered nails and tacks on the driveway. (Bodick Tr. 2316.)

257. In 1977, Jack Cauley Chevrolet was also picketed for opening on Saturday. (CX 3804 at 94.) Many of the dealers' cars were damaged by the picketers. (CX 3804 at 90-92).

258. In 1978 or 1979, Rowan Oldsmobile attempted to open on Saturday at new car announcement time. A number of cars suffered scratches and broken windshields. (Rowan, CX 3854 at 74.) The dealer closed on Saturdays. (CX 3854 at 75-77).

259. In February 1979, Buff Whelan Chevrolet planned an invitation-only sale on a Saturday. (Muir Tr. 3398-99.) When the

<sup>6</sup> "Keying" a car refers to the practice of scratching the paint on a car with a set of keys or other sharp object. (Costentino Tr. 3074-76.)

dealership opened on Saturday, it was picketed again by about 100 to 150 picketers. The picketers were salesmen at other dealerships. They tried to intimidate the customers who came to the sale. A number of used cars on the lot were vandalized. The police were called, and arrests were made. (Muir Tr. 3403-05.)

260. A group of salesmen became concerned that more dealers might be planning to open. They also were concerned about [37] potential liability for damages resulting from demonstrations. They therefore had a lawyer create for them the Professional Automobile Salesmen of Michigan, Inc. ("PASM"). (Bufalino Tr. 3686-87.) About 850 salesmen joined PASM. (CX 3936A.) The PASM was an association of salesmen, but it was not a union. (Bufalino Tr. 3696.) The members had no interest in negotiating contracts or in making any changes in working conditions. They sought only to convince dealers to remain closed on Saturdays and three evenings during the week. (Bufalino Tr. 3694.)

261. The PASM picketed Sullivan Volkswagen on Saturday, March 24, 1979. (CX 3536A.) There were 250 picketers, some of whom threw nails on the driveway and rocks through windows, and vandalized cars. (CX 3536A-B; Sullivan, Sr. Tr. 505.) Fifteen cars were damaged. (CX 3536A.) The picketing resumed the following Saturday, but the picketers were dispersed by police with dogs. (Sullivan, Sr. Tr. 506.) Several arrests were made. (Bufalino Tr. 3691.)

262. On the same day that Sullivan Volkswagen was picketed, the PASM also picketed Brian Luman Volkswagen. The picketing was for the same reason—Luman was open on Saturday. Luman Volkswagen thereafter "closed Saturdays to avoid union trouble." (CX 3536.) The PASM also picketed at Key Oldsmobile. There were about 75 picketers, and the dealership was vandalized. (Bufalino Tr. 3698.)

263. About 1979, Mike Dorian Ford opened on a Saturday. (CX 3817 at 29-30.) There were about 150 to 200 picketers to keep Saturdays closed. (CX 3817 at 34.) After an hour or two of being picketed, the dealership closed. (CX 3817 at 29-32.)

264. Mel Farr tried to extend the hours at Mel Farr Ford in 1981 by staying open to midnight on Fridays and all day on Saturdays. (Farr Tr. 438.) Fifty to seventy-five of his cars were vandalized one night. Mr. Farr was also run off the road, was subjected to harassment, and received some threatening telephone calls. (Farr Tr. 441-42.) His children were also threatened. (Farr Tr. 459.) He resumed his normal hours. (Farr Tr. 440.)

265. In the spring of 1981, Skalne Ford reopened on Saturdays. The salesmen at the dealership opposed the opening. (Skalne Tr. 2919.) After two or three weeks, the salesmen stopped coming to work on Saturdays. The customers never showed up, and after 10 weeks with no sales or salesmen, the dealership gave up and closed on Saturdays. (Skalne Tr. 2921-22.)

266. In 1981, Dreisbach Buick decided to open on Saturday. The following Monday, the rear windows on 12 to 15 cars had been smashed. The dealer opened again the next Saturday, and had three cars vandalized with paint. Following the second incident, the dealership remained closed on Saturdays. (Dreisbach, CX 3814 at 41-42.) [38]

267. Taylor AMC reopened on Saturdays after 1976. The Teamsters picketed and forced the dealership to close in October 1982. (Bell Tr. 3137; RX 450C.)

268. Bob Saks Oldsmobile was picketed about 1982 or 1983 when it tried to extend its hours. (Cauley, CX 3804 at 93-94.) The dealership was harassed. (CX 3804 at 94.)

269. Falvey Toyota tried to extend its hours in 1983. It decided to open in the evenings. The dealership was picketed. The picketers were "blocking customers from coming in, shouting obscenities and making threats. The police were called. The picketers were salesmen at competing dealerships." (Fuller Tr. 353-56.)

270. In October 1983, Taylor AMC made a renewed effort to extend its evening hours. It was picketed by salesmen from other dealerships, who sought to force Taylor to resume its shorter hours. (CX 3538; Bell Tr. 3137.) Taylor is now open late only on Monday and Thursday evenings. (JX 2S.)

271. In October 1984, an American Motors dealership, Tel-Twelve AMC, opened on Saturdays. It was repeatedly picketed and vandalized. (CX 3539.) There were 200 salesmen picketing Tel-Twelve AMC. (CX 3513.) A rock was thrown through a window. Cars were damaged. Picketers also physically impeded customers from entering the dealership, put tacks in the driveway and scratched a customer's car. (Cini Tr. 583-86.) The salesmen did not want to work Saturdays. (CX 3541.)

272. The managers of Tel-Twelve AMC also owned Southfield Dodge. The sales people increased the pressure on Tel-Twelve by vandalizing Southfield Dodge. (CX 3540, CX 3541.)

273. In 1981, Joseph Cosentino began working as a salesman at

Patrick Oldsmobile. He began going to the dealership on Saturdays for four or five hours in order to contact his prior customers to let them know he was working at a new dealership. He began to get threats. Some were to injure him personally, and some were to damage cars at the dealership. The threat to cause damage was carried out. He stopped his Saturday work. (Cosentino Tr. 367-76.)

274. When Walt Lazar Chevrolet opened for a sale on a Saturday, the dealership received a bomb threat. (Cole, CX 3808 at 15; Lazar, CX 3831 at 21.) When Bill Greig Buick opened on a Saturday in June 1984, "the union called me . . . and threatened if I opened that they would bust my windows and do a few things to make me regret it. . . ." (CX 3822 at 39, CX 3541.) Mr. Greig was aware that two weeks earlier, the union did \$8,000 damage to Royal Oak Ford when it tried to open on Saturday. (CX 3822 at 40.)[39]

275. Murphy Chevrolet also attempted to open for a special sale in 1979. It was picketed by 20 picketers, and tacks were strewn on the driveway to damage tires. (Murphy, CX 3846 at 45.)

276. The Lincoln-Mercury district sales manager for Detroit suggested that the dealers open on a Saturday in the early 1980s as part of a special promotion connected with a customer rebate program. (Gibbs Tr. 641.) One dealer received a telephone call. The anonymous caller said: "We have been successful in having the dealers close their places on Saturday. We want to keep it that way. . . . We know your daughter is a student at the University of Detroit and we know what route you take to work each day." (Gibbs Tr. 642.)

277. The dealers' uniform year-round closing stopped the Teamsters organization activity in the early 1970s. By conceding to the salesmen on the question of the five-day work week, the dealers preempted the only issue able to attract many salesmen to the union. (Somerville Tr. 3744.)

278. The Teamsters have made numerous efforts to organize dealerships since the 1973 closings. In the first year or two after the dealerships closed, the Teamsters organized the salesmen at about four dealerships and the mechanics at about six. (Somerville Tr. 3759.)

279. At Genthe Chevrolet, unions made repeated efforts to unionize the employees. The ASA tried to unionize the salesmen in 1968, and were defeated. (Genthe, Sr. Tr. 2368.) The Teamsters tried to organize the salesmen in 1971. Again the union lost. (Genthe, Sr. Tr.

2378.) Also in 1971, the Teamsters tried and failed to organize the back end. (Genthe, Sr. Tr. 2381-82.) In 1974, the Teamsters again tried unsuccessfully to unionize the salesmen. (Genthe, Sr. Tr. 2395-96.) The Teamsters again tried to unionize the front end in 1978. (RX 2857.) This time, the Teamsters finally prevailed. (Genthe, Sr. Tr. 2385.) Two nearby Chevrolet dealers began reducing their commissions to a flat rate on several well-selling cars. Although Mr. Genthe had not reduced his commissions, the fear that he would do so led the salesmen to vote in the Teamsters. (CX 3819 at 39-40.)

280. The leadership of the Teamsters changed in late 1981. Following the change, the Teamsters initiated a campaign to organize the salesmen in the Detroit area. (RX 751, RX 433, RX 434.)

281. One of the dealerships that the Teamsters tried to organize in or around 1981 was Buff Whelan Chevrolet. Although the dealership was already closed on Saturday, the salesmen knew that the dealer wanted to be open on Saturdays. The fear that the dealer would reopen was exploited by the Teamsters in an effort to unionize the salesmen. (CX 3866 at 54.) [40]

282. The Teamsters more recently tried to organize salesmen for the specific purpose of maintaining Saturday closings. The Teamsters held several meetings in January 1985. The first meeting was attended by at least 300 or 400 salesmen. (Thomson Tr. 2048; deFrancis, CX 3811 at 28.) The salesmen asked a number of questions, mostly involving the threat of reopening on Saturdays. (Thomson Tr. 2049.)

283. Following the meetings, a number of election petitions were filed. The overriding issue was the salesmen's "fear the FTC will try to force them to work longer hours." (RX 863; Ritchie Tr. 1355; Wink Tr. 1627; Schmid Tr. 1932; Stewart Tr. 3458-59.)

284. If dealers in Detroit were required to open on Saturdays, they would join a union and strike. (Carnahan Tr. 2238-39; Colombo Tr. 1719; Stringari Tr. 1551.)

#### *F. Dealers Closed to Meet Salesmen's Demands*

285. Most dealers opposed the reductions in their hours and remained open until forced to close by strikes, threats and destruction of property, and being advised by their counsel that their best chance for avoiding labor unrest would be to shorten showroom hours uniformly. (F. 89, 144, 241.)

286. There were numerous discussions among salesmen and dealers



which led to the shortening of hours since 1959. The evidence was undisputed that all of these discussions from the 1950s to the present were initiated by the salesmen. (Ryan Tr. 2660; Dreisbach Tr. 3351.)

287. The primary motive for the dealers closing in the evenings and on Saturdays was to meet the demands and pressure of the salesmen. (North Tr. 1439; McIntyre Tr. 1993-2004; Wink Tr. 1620.)

*G. The Hours Restraint Was Part of Some Collective Bargaining Agreements*

1. Thompson Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc., Joseph P. Thompson and Westborn Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc.

288. The hours restraint was part of a series of formal collective bargaining agreements covering Thompson's and Westborn's sales employees from 1973-1983. In each instance, the language of the restraint—a maintenance of standards provision [41]—was identical. (RX 1006T, RX 1011Z-AA, RX 1013Z-AA; RX 1030Y; RX 1053Z-AA.) The maintenance of standards clause effectively precluded Thompson and Westborn from extending their showroom hours.

289. The restraint also was the product of bona fide arms-length bargaining. The maintenance of standards provisions represented a compromise from each side's positions. (Somerville Tr. 3740; Burwell Tr. 2118-19.)

2. Suburban Motors Company, Inc.

290. On August 12, 1968, Suburban Motors Company, Inc. ("Suburban"), an Oldsmobile dealership, and the ASA entered into a three-year collective bargaining agreement (the second collective bargaining agreement between Suburban and the ASA) effective through August 31, 1971. (RX 2991A-Z-17.) The agreement included the dealer's hours of operation. (RX 2991A-Z-28.)

291. On September 2, 1971, Suburban and Teamsters Local 212, the ASA's successor, entered into a third collective bargaining agreement, which was in effect until March 23, 1973. (RX 2993B, RX 3344A.) The 1971 agreement contained the following maintenance of standards provision. RX 2993B:

The employer agrees that all conditions of employment relating to wages, hours of work, overtime differentials and general working conditions shall be maintained at not less than the highest standards in effect at the time of the signing of this Agreement, and the conditions of employment shall be improved wherever specific provisions for improvement are made elsewhere in this Agreement.

The agreement precluded Suburban from extending its hours of operation without the union's consent.

3. Fischer Buick-Subaru, Inc. and Carl E. Fischer

292. From November 1, 1968 until May 1972, Fischer Buick-Subaru, Inc. ("Fischer") sales employees were represented first by the ASA and then by its successors, Teamsters Local 212.

293. On November 9, 1971, Fischer and Teamsters Local 212 entered into a second collective bargaining agreement covering [42] the dealership's sales employees. (CX 3625A-C.) The agreement contained a maintenance of standards provision identical to that contained in the September 2, 1971 Suburban collective bargaining agreement.

4. Crestwood Dodge, Inc.

294. From 1967 until July 1974, Crestwood Dodge, Inc.'s ("Crestwood") sales employees were represented first by the ASA and then its successors, Teamsters Local 212 and Teamsters Local 376. (RX 341G; Dittrich Tr. 3182.)

295. During 1970-1971, George Beals, Crestwood's dealer/operator at the time, and the ASA-SIUNA negotiated a new collective bargaining agreement for a three-year term. (RX 3442H-I.) The dealership's hours of operation were specifically set forth in the agreement. (RX 3442H.)

5. Dick Genthe Chevrolet, Inc. and Richard Genthe, Sr.

296. Teamsters Local 376 has represented Dick Genthe Chevrolet, Inc.'s ("Genthe") sales employees since February 13, 1979. As a result of past practice, Genthe and Teamsters Local 376 have an unwritten understanding that the dealership will be closed on Saturdays and on weekday evenings other than Mondays and Thursdays, which has become part of the dealership's collective bargaining agreement. (Genthe Tr. 3319-20.)

297. "Consistent Past Practice" is a rule of labor agreement construction, whereby the parties can modify the terms of the written collective bargaining agreement. (Burwell Tr. 2129-30.)

6. Tennyson Chevrolet, Inc. and Harry Tennyson

298. Tennyson Chevrolet, Inc. ("Tennyson") and Harry Tennyson have a long history of negotiating the terms and conditions of

employment with the dealership's sales employees, irrespective of whether such sales employees were represented by a union. (Tennyson 1793-1801.)

299. In 1960, Tennyson and its sales employees—without formal representation by any union—negotiated the sales employees' terms and conditions of employment, including the dealership's hours of operations. (Tennyson Tr. 1973.) The sales employees submitted a written contract proposal. [43] (RX 2915A-B; Tennyson Tr. 1795.) After modification of the sales employees' request, the dealership agreed in writing to close at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday and Saturday evenings, and agreed to provide certain other benefits. (RX 2914A-H; Tennyson Tr. 1799.)

#### *H. Competitive Effect of Closings*

300. There was no evidence that the Saturday closings caused an increase in retail prices of cars sold in the Detroit area. (Klein Tr. 836.)

301. The showroom hours reductions did not cause an increase in gross margins as a percentage of sales of car dealers in the Detroit area. (Klein Tr. 840, 910.)[44]

### III. LEGAL DISCUSSION

The antitrust laws were enacted to foster competition in the marketplace. The labor laws permit the elimination of competition over wages, hours and working conditions. These two policies sometimes conflict. In order to resolve this conflict, Congress and the courts developed a "broad labor exemption from the antitrust laws"<sup>7</sup> for concerted activities arising from a labor dispute. If the activity is motivated by a concern with working conditions and if the primary effect of the activity is in the labor market, the exemption applies even though it restrains trade. *Amalgamated Meat Cutters v. Jewel Tea Co.*, 381 U.S. 676 (1965). In *Jewel Tea*, the butchers' demand for an end to evening business hours in Chicago led to a collective bargaining agreement closing all meat departments at 6:00 p.m. Despite the alleged effect on competition among retailers and despite the inconvenience to consumers, the Supreme Court exempted the concerted conduct of employers and workers from the antitrust laws.

#### *A. Development of Federal Labor Policies*

In the early twentieth century, employers used the Sherman Act as

<sup>7</sup> *Associated General Contractors v. California State Council of Carpenters*, 459 U.S. 519, 539 (1983).

a weapon to prevent union action. Strikes or picketing were held to violate the Sherman Act. *Loewe v. Lawlor*, 208 U.S. 274 (1908).

In 1914, Congress in the Clayton Act limited injunctive relief in a labor dispute. 29 U.S.C. 52. When the Court refused to exempt union activity in *Duplex Printing Press Co. v. Deering*, 254 U.S. 443 (1921), Justice Brandeis' dissent shaped current labor policies.<sup>8</sup>

Justice Brandeis would have found that a strike to obtain uniformity of working conditions is a valid exercise of a union's legitimate self-interest. 254 U.S. at 480-81. He further would have decided that the relationship between employers and workingmen is a struggle which will necessarily result in some incidental injuries to the public. These resulting injuries should not be judged under the antitrust laws. 254 U.S. at [45] 486-88. Where the "industrial combatants" are acting in their legitimate self-interest, Justice Brandeis concluded, courts should not interfere on the basis that the resolution of such conflict endangers other community interests, *e.g.*, the antitrust laws. 254 U.S. at 488.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932 expanded the statutory exemption. 29 U.S.C. 101-115. The statute prohibited courts from issuing injunctions (except in conformity with the labor laws) "in a case involving or growing out of a labor dispute." It also prohibited injunctions "contrary to the public policy declared in this chapter." 29 U.S.C. 101. The public policy was stated explicitly. The ultimate goal is "to obtain acceptable terms and conditions of employment." To obtain this goal, the workers are guaranteed the right to engage in concerted activity "for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection,"<sup>9</sup> but a worker also "should be free to decline to associate with his fellows." 29 U.S.C. 102.

The Act defined labor dispute to include "any controversy concerning terms or conditions of employment . . . regardless of whether the disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer and employee." 29 U.S.C. 113(c). A person interested in a labor dispute includes both employers and employees. 29 U.S.C. 113(b). And the law defines when a case involves or grows out of a labor dispute. 29 U.S.C. 113(a):

<sup>8</sup> "Mr. Justice Brandeis' dissent in *Duplex* has . . . carried the day in the courts of history as evidenced by [the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932 and decisions of this Court]." *Jewel Tea*, 381 U.S. at 703 (Justice Goldberg, concurring).

<sup>9</sup> The phrase "other mutual aid or protection" is significant. The labor laws protect non-unionized employees who engage in concerted activity apart from collective bargaining. *NLRB v. Washington Aluminum Co.*, 370 U.S. 9 (1962).

... [W]hen the case involves persons who are engaged in the same industry, trade, craft, or occupation; or have direct or indirect interests therein; or who are employees of the same employer; or who are members of the same or an affiliated organization of employers or employees; whether such dispute is (1) between one or more employers or associations of employers and one or more employees or associations of employees; (2) between one or more employers or associations of employers and one or more employers or associations of employers . . . .

The Norris-LaGuardia Act thus makes several points clear. Courts should not interfere with labor disputes except to further the policies of the labor laws. The overriding policy of the [46] labor laws is to achieve better working conditions, and to obtain such conditions employees may choose to unionize or not to unionize. The law protects employees in their decision to obtain improvements in working conditions through collective action or individually. Collective action is not limited to collective bargaining, but includes a broad range of "mutual aid." Finally, the section quoted above demonstrates that employers and associations of employers are parties to labor disputes, with the same protection as employees.<sup>10</sup>

In *Apex Hosiery Co. v. Leader*, 310 U.S. 469 (1940), workers at a stocking manufacturer engaged in a sit-down strike, acts of violence and vandalism. 310 U.S. at 481-82. The Court ruled that, although the union's activities were unlawful and "reprehensible," they did not violate the antitrust laws. 310 U.S. at 483-84.

The sit-down strike affected competition. The plant was forcibly closed, and the strikers blocked the shipment of finished inventory. The union sought to eliminate competition based on different labor standards. This elimination of competition, however, was viewed as legitimate employee self-interest. 310 U.S. at 503. The activity in *Apex Hosiery* was by a non-unionized sales force. At the time of the sit-down strike, only eight of the firm's 2,500 employees were union members. 310 U.S. at 514. The union's activities did not violate the antitrust laws. The action arose as a result of a labor dispute, and its underlying purpose was to restrict competition in the labor market, not in the sale of stockings. 310 U.S. at 501-02.

Shortly after *Apex Hosiery*, the court decided *United States v. Hutcheson*, 312 U.S. 219 (1941). The case concerned a boycott that arose from a dispute between two unions over the right to perform certain jobs for Anheuser-Busch. 312 U.S. at 227-38. The court held

<sup>10</sup> An English statute in 1825 legalized agreements between employers fixing wages. Oppenheim, *Cases on Federal Anti-Trust Laws*, p. 51 (1st ed. 1948).

the boycott exempt from the antitrust laws so long as a union acts in its self-interest and not in combination with non-labor groups, the court stated that the exemption does not depend upon "any judgment regarding the wisdom or unwisdom, the rightness or wrongness, the selfishness or unselfishness of the end of which the particular union activities are the means." 312 U.S. at 232. The fact that the union believed the action was in its self-interest was sufficient.

The court recognized the limits to the statutory exemption in *Allen Bradley Co. v. Local Union No. 3, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers*, 325 U.S. 797 (1945). The union agreed with manufacturers of electrical equipment in New York City to prevent the sale in New York of electrical equipment [47] manufactured elsewhere. An excluded manufacturer brought suit against the union. The court denied the statutory exemption, holding that the union aided and abetted a conspiracy by the manufacturers to control prices, and thus was not entitled to the protection of the exemption. 325 U.S. at 809-10. The employees sought to achieve improved working conditions indirectly, by limiting business competition in the expectation that higher profitability by their employers would ultimately result in higher wages. 325 U.S. at 799-800.<sup>11</sup>

The importance of whose interests are primarily being served was also determinative in *United States v. Women's Sportswear Manufacturers Association*, 336 U.S. 460 (1949). A group of competitors engaged in concerted activity to allocate business and control prices. The activity did not result from a labor dispute. Based on the circumstances of the industry and in the light of the origin of the agreement, the court found that its intent and effect was to restrict competition and to control prices and markets. 336 U.S. at 463. Along with the division of markets and price fixing, the agreement allocated among contractors and jobbers the requirement to pay unemployment compensation insurance and to contribute to the health and vacation fund for the contractors' employees. *United States v. Women's Sportswear Manufacturers Association*, 75 F. Supp. 112, 115-16 (D. Mass. 1947). The conspirators argued that including labor-related provisions in a price fixing agreement immunized the agreement. In rejecting this argument, the court ruled that incidental benefits to labor cannot immunize an agreement that primarily and directly restrains competition. 336 U.S. at 464 ("... [B]enefits to organized

<sup>11</sup> The question of whose interests are primarily served, based on the goals and effect of the agreement, has guided the statutory and nonstatutory exemptions to the present. *Connell Construction Co. v. Plumbers and Steamfitters Local Union No. 100*, 421 U.S. 616, 625 (1975).

labor cannot be utilized as a cat's-paw to pull employers' chestnuts out of the antitrust fires.") This is the reverse of *Allen Bradley*. Just as workers cannot indirectly achieve improved working conditions by restraining business competition, competitors cannot exempt a price fixing conspiracy by pointing to benefits to their workers. [48]

### B. *Jewel Tea*

The leading case on the nonstatutory labor exemption<sup>12</sup> is *Amalgamated Meat Cutters v. Jewel Tea*, 381 U.S. 676 (1965).<sup>13</sup>

There, 9,000 retail food stores in the Chicago area had total sales of \$5 billion. Jewel Tea operated 196 food stores in the area. It sought to sell self-service meat in the evenings. However, an agreement between the Meat Cutters Union and several thousand food retailers represented by the food retailers association prohibited sales of meat after 6:00 p.m. Jewel Tea sued the union and the association under the antitrust laws. *Jewel Tea v. Local Unions I*, 274 F.2d 210, 220; *Jewel Tea*, 381 U.S. at 682-84. [49]

The butchers in Chicago had been concerned with the length of their work week for many years. In 1919, they struck in opposition to an 81 hour, seven day work week. At the time of the suit, the hours were 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. six days a week (54 hours). *Jewel Tea v. Local Unions III*, 215 F. Supp. at 841-42.

The majority of the butchers opposed night work, but 28 voted for night work in a mail ballot. 215 F. Supp. at 844. The employers "meet in advance of negotiations to explore their objectives, and caucus periodically to determine their bargaining position." 215 F. Supp. at 842. The union opposed night work, and the employers ultimately agreed. The collective bargaining agreement provided that the union

<sup>12</sup> The nonstatutory labor exemption, used to judge a combination between a labor and a non-labor group, was defined by the Court in *Connell Co. v. Plumbers & Steamfitters Local 100*, 421 U.S. 616, 622 (1975).

The nonstatutory exemption has its source in the strong labor policy favoring the association of employees to eliminate competition over wages and working conditions. Union success in organizing workers and standardizing wages ultimately will affect price competition among employers, but the goals of federal labor law never could be achieved if this effect on business competition were held a violation of the antitrust laws. The Court therefore has acknowledged that labor policy requires tolerance for the lessening of business competition based on differences in wages and working conditions. See *Mine Workers v. Pennington*, [381 U.S.] at 666, *Jewel Tea*, [381 U.S.] at 692-693 (opinion of White, J.).

<sup>13</sup> The history of the case is in *Jewel Tea Co. v. Local Unions, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen*, 274 F.2d 217 (7th Cir.), cert. denied, 362 U.S. 936 (1960) (hereinafter *Jewel Tea v. Local Unions I*); *Jewel Tea Co. v. Local Unions, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen*, 215 F. Supp. 837 (N.D. Ill. 1962) (hereinafter *Jewel Tea v. Local Unions II*); *Jewel Tea Co. v. Local Unions, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen*, 215 F. Supp. 839 (N.D. Ill. 1963) (hereinafter *Jewel Tea v. Local Unions III*); and *Jewel Tea Co. v. Associated Food Retailers of Greater Chicago, Inc.*, 331 F.2d 547 (7th Cir. 1964) (hereinafter *Jewel Tea v. Associated Retailers*).

would not enter into a contract with any other employer designating lower wages, longer hours or any more favorable conditions of employment. 215 F. Supp. at 842.

During negotiations, Jewel Tea offered a proposal that would allow it to remain open in the evening without butchers on duty. 215 F. Supp. at 846. The district court found, however, that this proposal would increase the butchers' work load during the day, or shift their jobs to other employees, or force them to work in the evening. 215 F. Supp. at 846.

The district court was convinced that the employees sought the elimination of night marketing to further their own interests, and not "as a tool of the employer group" or at their behest. 215 F. Supp. at 846. Nonetheless, there were competitive benefits for the grocers. By closing in unison, the food markets were able to cut their operating costs without risking the loss of business to more aggressive competitors like Jewel Tea. *Jewel Tea v. Local Unions I*, 274 F.2d at 222.

*Jewel Tea* is remarkably similar to this case. It involved a labor dispute over the length of the work week. Employees were working far longer hours than normal. The employees believed that shortening their hours of work without shortening the employer's hours of operation would adversely affect their employment. The employees demanded that all employers abide by uniform hours of operation. The employers resisted the employees' demands for shorter hours, and in the face of actual and threatened strikes gave in gradually. Some employees were willing to work the longer hours, and some employers preferred to extend their hours. Some markets profited from the shorter hours, so that their interests and the employees' interests coincided. Nonetheless, the employees demanded the shorter hours of operation in their own self-interest.

The only material distinction from this case is that the food retailers in Chicago formally negotiated the hours reduction with the union whereas the car dealers in Detroit, with the advice of their associations, gave in to the demands of their employees and unions to avoid formal multi-employer bargaining. [50]

Justice White wrote an opinion in *Jewel Tea*, joined by the Chief Justice and Justice Brennan.<sup>14</sup> He addressed the subject matter of the

<sup>14</sup> Justice Goldberg, joined by Justice Harlan and Justice Stewart, concurred in the result in an opinion which would provide a broader scope to the exemption. 381 U.S. at 697. Justice Goldberg's view was that "collective bargaining activity concerning mandatory subjects of bargaining" is exempt, regardless of the nature of the

(footnote continued)



agreement. Where there is an elected union, the labor laws require bargaining over "wages, hours and working conditions, and this fact weighs heavily in favor of antitrust exemption for agreements on these subjects." 381 U.S. at 689.

Justice White then considered whether the restriction on hours of operation was sufficiently related to a mandatory subject of bargaining that an agreement on hours would be exempt. This was the crucial issue. 381 U.S. at 689-90:

Thus the issue in this case is whether the marketing-hours restriction, like wages, and unlike prices, is so intimately related to wages, hours and working conditions that the unions' successful attempt to obtain that provision through bona fide, arm's-length bargaining in pursuit of their own labor union policies, and not at the behest of or in combination with nonlabor groups, falls within the protection of the national labor policy and is therefore exempt from the Sherman Act.

The court of appeals had ruled that the hours of operation of business involved a "proprietary" management decision, at the grocer's discretion, which was not exempt. The Supreme Court, however, ruled that the agreement on which hours were worked was exempt. 381 U.S. at 690-91, 697. Justice White noted that it was "impractical" for stores, even self-service markets, to remain open at night without there being some effect on the butchers' legitimate interests. 381 U.S. at 694.

For over forty years the butchers had opposed night work and had consistently sought not just to shorten the work week but to shorten the hours of operation of the markets. Both employers and employees recognized a relationship between the butchers' work week and the markets' hours of operation. 381 U.S. at 695-97. [51]

The court ruled that "the union's unilateral demand for the same contract of other employers in the industry" was also exempt. 381 U.S. at 691.<sup>15</sup> The fact that uniformity also served the employers' interests, and that the contract required uniformity, did not detract from the protected nature of the union's demand for uniform hours.

The court concluded that the agreement setting uniform hours of operation was exempt pursuant to the nonstatutory exemption. Although the court did not explicitly address whether the exemption protects employers as well as employees, such a conclusion is inherent

activity, the intent of the participants, the effect of the activity, or any other factor. 381 U.S. at 709-10 (Emphasis added.)

<sup>15</sup> Unions have a legitimate interest in eliminating competition based on differences in wages, hours and working conditions. *Duplex*, 254 U.S. at 480-81; *Apex Hosiery*, 310 U.S. at 503.

in the decision. The employer association and its representative were defendants. The dismissal of the case was equally applicable to them.<sup>16</sup>

### C. *The Applicability of the Labor Exemption*

The history of the development of the labor exemption to the antitrust laws shows that, where joint employer action is aimed at restraining trade, claims that the action is designed to benefit employees will not immunize that action; but where the collaboration is directed toward resisting labor demands on issues within the purview of the labor laws, the exemption applies. *Jewel Tea*, for example, shows that concerted employer activity is exempt from the antitrust laws if it was motivated by labor concerns rather than business concerns and its effect on labor concerns is more direct than its effect on business concerns. Thus, the central issue of whose interests are being served can be determined by looking at the evidence of whether there was a labor dispute leading to concerted activity, as well as the motivation for that activity and its effect on the dispute and on competition. [52]

#### 1. Labor Dispute

Complaint counsel argue that the closings here resulted from a conspiracy among the dealers and other respondents and did not grow out of a labor dispute, relying on the fact that the closings resulted primarily without formal collective bargaining agreements. (Complaint counsel's brief at pp. 157-60.) Since many of the dealers were attempting to avoid unions among their employees (F. 285), most of the concessions on closings were not part of such formal, written agreements.<sup>17</sup>

The issue is, however, whether the closings grew out of a labor

<sup>16</sup> Subsequent cases have held that the nonstatutory exemption protects employers as well as employees. *Mid-America Regional Bargaining Association v. Will County Carpenters District Council*, 675 F.2d 881, 890 n. 22 (7th Cir. 1982), cert. denied, 459 U.S. 860 (1982); *Mackey v. National Football League*, 543 F.2d 606, 612 (8th Cir. 1976), cert. dismissed, 434 U.S. 801 (1977); *Scooper Dooper, Inc. v. Kraftco Corp.*, 494 F.2d 840, 847 n. 14 (3rd Cir. 1974).

<sup>17</sup> Complaint counsel argue that respondents may have committed an unfair labor practice by giving workers a benefit with intent to defeat unionization. (Brief at p. 162.) This argument could have merit. *NLRB v. Exchange Parts Co.*, 375 U.S. 405, 409 (1964). However, "... it cannot be that every time it can be shown that an employer was seeking to stay one step ahead of unionization he was guilty of an unfair labor practice." *NLRB v. Gotham Industries, Inc.*, 406 F.2d 1306, 1310 (1st Cir. 1969). This issue, moreover, was not pled or tried in this case. (Complaint counsel's brief at 113, n. 1.) But even if such a case could be made, the exemption may not be denied even if the party is seeking it for acts which violate the labor laws. *Zimmerman v. National Football League*, 632 F. Supp. 398, 404-05 (D.D.C. 1986). Complaint counsels' argument to the contrary is based on an exemption involving "hot cargo" cases not the nonstatutory exemption. *Ibid.*

dispute, not whether they resulted from collective bargaining agreements. Concerted employer activity responding to union-led action, even in the absence of a collective bargaining agreement, may still be exempt if it grows out of a labor dispute. *Richards v. Neilsen Freight Lines*, 810 F.2d 898, 905 (9th Cir. 1987); *Amalgamated Meat Cutters v. Wetterau Foods, Inc.*, 597 F.2d 133, 136 (8th Cir. 1979); *Zimmerman v. National Football League*, 632 F. Supp. 398, 404 (D.D.C. 1986). It is the collective bargaining process that deserves protection, not just collective bargaining agreements.<sup>18</sup> The labor laws protect not [53] just the negotiation of collective bargaining agreements between the employer and the union, but the full relationship among employees and employers. *NLRB v. Washington Aluminum Co.*, 370 U.S. 9 (1962); *New Negro Alliance v. Sanitary Grocery Co.*, 303 U.S. 552 (1938); *Vic Tanny International v. NLRB*, 622 F.2d 237 (6th Cir. 1980).<sup>19</sup> In the absence of a collective bargaining agreement, where the "employer-employee relationship" is the "matrix of the controversy" the labor exemption will apply. *Jacksonville Bulk Terminals v. Longshoremen*, 457 U.S. 702, 713 n. 12 (1982) (dictum).

The record shows that the closings by dealers were the result of a labor dispute—the give and take of a struggle between labor and management. Some closings were in fact collectively bargained.<sup>20</sup> (F. 288–89; Tennyson Tr. 1793–95.) Sales employees and their unions attempted to negotiate a uniform closing as part of the formal collective bargaining negotiations. (F. 167–69, 174–75, 179; Demmer

<sup>18</sup> The exemption was denied in *Connell Construction Co. v. Plumbers & Steamfitters Local 100*, 421 U.S. 616 (1975), even though there was a written collective bargaining contract between the union and other employers, because the agreement at issue was not in the context of collective bargaining and was a direct restraint on the business market that did not flow naturally from elimination of competition over wages and working conditions. The union disclaimed interest in unionizing the general contractors' employees but entered into an agreement preventing the contractor from dealing with subcontractors, regardless of how efficient they were, unless they had a contract with the union.

<sup>19</sup> The Norris-LaGuardia Act defines a labor dispute to extend beyond the formal union/employer bargaining situation. 28 U.S.C. 102. The exemption therefore "applies throughout the bargaining process, and not simply to the finished agreement." Areeda and Turner, *Antitrust Law* at 199 (1978).

<sup>20</sup> Several respondents did negotiate collective bargaining agreements with an hours restraint. (F. 288–99.) A collective bargaining agreement includes unwritten agreements and custom. *United Steel Workers of America v. Warrior & Gulf Navigation Co.*, 363 U.S. 574, 578–80 (1960). Even though a written collective bargaining agreement does not require a dealer to shorten its showroom hours, reductions undoubtedly became part of the custom of employer-employee relationships in dealerships in the Detroit area. The record shows that the parties to bargaining agreements treated the shorter hours as a contractual requirement. (RX 506B-C; Sullivan Tr. 505; Burwell Tr. 2129–30; Genthe Tr. 3318–19.) The parties to Teamsters' labor contracts, for example, interpreted the "maintenance of standards" provision in the written collective bargaining agreements to preclude dealers from opening on Saturday. (F. 229–31, 243.) And when a dealership has been closed on Saturdays and weekday evenings, other than Mondays and Thursdays, this conduct becomes part of the collective bargaining agreement as a result of the dealerships' past practice. (F. 244.)

Tr. 2578-79; Thompson Tr. 3241-42.) Sales employees negotiated a prohibition on reopening. (Burwell Tr. 2114, 2126.) Dealers attempted to resolve the sales employee's demand to close on Saturday by closing on other days. The sales employees refused. (F. 235.) Dealers attempted to resolve the demands for closing by splitting shifts. (F. 172, 236-37.) The sales employees got into fist [54] fights over lost sales and demanded uniform shorter hours. (F. 99-104, 120-23.) Unions demanded uniform shorter hours and the sales employees went out on strike when dealers refused. (F. 108, 131, 135, 148, 189-92, 200-28.)<sup>21</sup> The sales employees and their unions reinforced their demands for uniform shorter hours by intimidation and violence on many occasions and over many years. (F. 84-85, 68 (1947); F. 164, 191-92 (1966); F. 210-21 (1971); F. 245-76 (1973-1984).) Gradually, over the years, dealers gave in and agreed to the sales employee's demands for uniform shorter hours. (F. 240-42, 285-87, 136-41, 193.)

Some dealers agreed orally and informally with sales employees and their unions to meet the demands for uniform shorter hours.<sup>22</sup> (F. 239.) This was part of the collective bargaining process. "... [T]o qualify for the exemption, the understanding between the parties need not be contained in a formal collective bargaining agreement." *Zimmerman v. National Football League*, 632 F. Supp. 398, 404 (D.D.C. 1986). The National Labor Relations Act does not require that a labor contract be in writing. *Labbe' v. W.M. Heroman & Co.*, 521 F. Supp. 1017, 1021 (M.D. La. 1981).

Complaint counsel argue that the closings were the result of a conspiracy among respondents, with little or no employee involvement in the agreement.<sup>23</sup> The weight of the evidence, however, shows substantial employee involvement in the closings, and that the concerted activity by respondents was impelled by that involvement. Just as in *Jewel Tea*, the employers here discussed among themselves the positions to take in dealing with the demands of labor. That concerted activity must be exempt even if no collective bargaining

<sup>21</sup> The filing and prosecution of employee grievances is a fundamental, day-to-day part of collective bargaining and is protected by the labor laws. *United States Postal Service v. NLRB*, 652 F.2d 409, 411 (5th Cir. 1981). The record in this case shows vigorous and long standing employee grievances by sales employees and their unions. (F. 108, 129-30, 147-48, 153-54, 206, 241, 282.) The settlement of these grievances by uniform closings was therefore part of the collective bargaining process even without any eventual written collective bargaining agreement.

<sup>22</sup> One dealer testified that after strikes and threats the union representative for his sales employees said: "We're not going to work the long hours." The dealer replied: "Hey, fellows, if that's what it takes, that's what I'll do." (F. 189.)

<sup>23</sup> Brief at p. 169; reply brief on conclusions of law at p. 26.

agreement results, or indeed even if the parties never actually conduct negotiations. Otherwise, the employers would have to come to the negotiating [55] table with no prior agreement on their common position. To be workable, the exemption must cover the full collective bargaining process.<sup>24</sup>

## 2. Concerted Activity

Paragraph 4 of the complaint alleges that respondents engaged in “agreement, contract, combination or conspiracy with each other and with other persons,” in adopting a schedule limiting hours of operation for the sale of cars in the Detroit area and attempting to persuade dealers to limit hours of operation. The record in this case shows that respondents engaged in concerted activity.<sup>25</sup> (F. 11-50.) This concerted activity grew out of a labor dispute and was in response to the demands of the sales employees and their unions. (F. 76-299.) The “other persons” involved in this concerted activity therefore included those employees and their union representatives. (See also, F. 189, 173, 238.)

## 3. Intent

The attempt to achieve uniform shorter hours of operation in this case was motivated by labor concerns. For decades the sales employees and their unions demanded uniform shorter hours of operation. (F. 101, 104, 107-08.) The dealers, usually coordinated by their associations (F. 11-13), closed in response to these demands. (F. 14-16.) The discussions among the dealers concerning uniformity primarily focused on the labor repercussions (F. 144, 158-59, 162) of closing rather than on the competitive repercussions. This evidence extends from the 1950s (F. 107) through the present. (F. 282-86.) A few dealers may have found that they profited from the shorter hours. (F. 57-62.) But the weight of the evidence shows that the dealers would not have shortened their hours but for the demands of their [56] employees. (F. 135, 140-41, 144, 162, 198, 236-37, 241, 285-87.)<sup>26</sup>

<sup>24</sup> *Volkswagenwerk Aktiengesellschaft v. FMC*, 390 U.S. 261, 287 n. 5 (1968) (Harlan, J., concurring: “It seems equally obvious that the employers are not violating the antitrust laws either when they confer about wage policy preparatory to bargaining or when they sign an agreement”).

<sup>25</sup> I do not, however, find a “conspiracy.” That pejorative label connotes an element of intent missing from this record. Oppenheim, *Federal Antitrust Laws* p. 178 n. 1 (3rd ed. 1968).

<sup>26</sup> Complaint counsel imply that respondents’ actions were actually motivated by “anti-union animus.” In the absence of a long history of substantial labor law violations, general hostility to the union does not constitute anti-union animus. *J.P. Stevens & Co. v. NLRB*, 638 F.2d 676, 680-81 (4th Cir. 1980); *Florida Steel Co. v.*

In *Jewel Tea*, grocery stores lowered their costs by closing during the evening, and negotiated a contractual provision requiring uniformity of hours. 274 F.2d at 222. But this fact was outweighed by the butchers' motivation for demanding the uniform shorter hours and the stores' motivation for acceding to the demands. The fact that some employers might have found that they benefit from the closings (F. 61) does not prove that the conduct was motivated solely by that benefit. *Lewis v. Pennington*, 400 F.2d 806, 814-15 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 393 U.S. 983 (1968).

#### 4. Absence of a Multi-Employer Bargaining Unit

Respondents have, for many years, cooperated to cope with the demands of car sales employees. (F. 11-50.) Yet, they have never applied for certification by the National Labor Relations Board as a multi-employer bargaining unit.<sup>27</sup> They were advised by counsel that such certification would make it easier for a union to gain a foothold.<sup>28</sup> (F. 89, 91, 157.) [57]

Complaint counsel contend that the labor exemption to the antitrust laws does not apply to concerted activity of employers acting outside of a collective bargaining context, and that the absence of certification as a multi-employer bargaining unit indicates a lack of intent to bargain. (Complaint counsel's brief pp. 160-62.)<sup>29</sup>

*NLRB*, 587 F.2d 735, 744 (5th Cir. 1979); *Plumbers and Steamfitters v. Morris*, 511 F. Supp. 1298, 1310 (E.D. Wash. 1981).

<sup>27</sup> One function of the National Labor Relations Board is to delineate collective bargaining units. *Multi-Employer Bargaining and the National Labor Relations Board*, 66 Harv. L.R. 886, 888 (1953). The power to order multi-employer bargaining does not derive from statutory enactment but is an instrument of the National Labor Board's policy and duty—the promotion of industrial peace through effective bargaining. *Tennessee Products & Chemical Corporation v. NLRB*, 423 F.2d 169, 177 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 400 U.S. 822 (1970).

<sup>28</sup> Union leaders prefer dealing with multi-employer bargaining units because they enhance union security, since a rival union must win a majority of a larger number of workers before it can replace a recumbent union, and such bargaining furthers standardization of wages and working conditions. 66 Harv. L. Rev. at 887.

<sup>29</sup> The strongest case cited for this argument is *Cordova v. Bache & Co.*, 321 F. Supp. 600 (S.D.N.Y. 1970). There, brokerage firms jointly agreed to reduce the commissions paid to their sales representatives, in the absence of any anticipated multi-employer agreement, or, indeed, of any labor organization representing the employees. The court held that, 321 F. Supp. at 607:

Because of the evils which such economic power may entail . . . multi-employer bargaining has been circumscribed by the proviso that it may not be unilaterally invoked by employers: the affected employees, through their collective bargaining representatives, must unequivocally consent to bargain with the multi-employer unit, *NLRB v. Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.*, 340 F.2d 690, 692-93 (2d Cir. 1965). Although the point at which employers may act jointly has not been fixed with certainty, such action is permissible only in connection with, or at most in preparation for, collective bargaining negotiations or agreements with employees or unions exempt from the prohibitions of the antitrust laws.

That case erroneously assumes, however, that the labor exemption does not protect any concerted action by employers. 321 F. Supp. at 607. Furthermore, it did not arise from a labor dispute and the concerted activity was intended to achieve solely business objectives. See the connected case, *Jacobi v. Bache & Co.* 377 F. Supp.

To understand whether the failure to have a certified multi-employer bargaining unit is a fatal lapse, resulting in a conspiracy, the policy reasons for multi-employer bargaining should be understood. [58]

The background of multi-employer bargaining was explained in *NLRB v. Truck Drivers Union*, 353 U.S. 87 (1957). There, a group of employers had formed a multi-employer bargaining unit. After the union struck and picketed the plant of one of those employers, other members of the employers' association closed their plants and locked out their employees until the strike was terminated. The court affirmed the finding of the board that this did not constitute an unfair labor practice, and traced the history and usefulness of multi-employer bargaining. 353 U.S. at 94-96:

... Multi-employer bargaining long antedated the Wagner Act, both in industries like the garment industry, characterized by numerous employers of small work forces, and in industries like longshoring and building construction, where workers change employers from day to day or week to week. This basis of bargaining has had its greatest expansion since enactment of the Wagner Act because employers have sought through group bargaining to match increased union strength. Approximately four million employees are now governed by collective bargaining agreements signed by unions with thousands of employer associations. At the time of the debates on the Taft-Hartley amendments, proposals were made to limit or outlaw multi-employer bargaining. These proposals failed of enactment. They were met with a storm of protest that their adoption would tend to weaken and not strengthen the process of collective bargaining and would conflict with the national labor policy of promoting industrial peace through effective collective bargaining.

The debates over the proposals demonstrate that Congress refused to interfere with such bargaining because there was cogent evidence that in many industries the multi-employer bargaining basis was a vital factor in the effectuation of the national policy of promoting labor peace through strengthened collective bargaining. The inaction of Congress with respect to multi-employer bargaining cannot be said to indicate an intention to leave the resolution of this problem to future legislation. Rather, the compelling conclusion is that Congress intended "that the board should continue its established administrative practice of certifying multi-employer units, and intended [59] to leave to the board's specialized judgment the inevitable questions concerning multi-employer bargaining bound to arise in the future. . . ."

Although the Act protects the right of the employees to strike in support of their demands, this protection is not so absolute as to deny self-help by employers when legitimate interests of employees and employers collide. Conflict may arise, for example, between the right to strike and the interest of small employers in preserving multi-employer bargaining as a means of bargaining on an equal basis with a large

86, 89 (S.D.N.Y. 1974), *aff'd*, 520 F.2d 1231 (2d Cir. 1975), *cert. denied*, 423 U.S. 1053 (1976). The case was therefore ruled by *United States v. Women's Sportswear Manufacturers Association*, 336 U.S. 460 (1949), in that the employers were hiding behind indirect labor effects to pull their "chestnuts out of the antitrust fires."

union and avoiding the competitive disadvantages resulting from nonuniform contractual terms. The ultimate problem is the balancing of the conflicting legitimate interests. The function of striking that balance to effectuate national labor policy is often a difficult and delicate responsibility, which the Congress committed primarily to the National Labor Relations Board, subject to limited judicial review.<sup>30</sup>

By their concerted activity, the respondents have attempted to achieve several policies for which multi-employer bargaining has been recognized. Respondents acted in the interest of small employers in dealing "on equal basis with a large union and avoiding competitive disadvantages resulting from nonuniform contractual terms." (F. 91.) They have sought "to match increased union strength." (F. 204-05.) And their concerted activity has effectuated "the national policy of promoting labor peace." (F. 242.) They have, nevertheless, attempted to obtain the benefits of a multi-employer bargaining unit while avoiding the unpleasant consequence (for them) of promoting unionization. If respondents' concerted activity "assumed the character of an offensive weapon which would unfairly advantage the employers"<sup>31</sup> in their dealings with the car salesmen and [60] their unions, they should not be rewarded for their failure to obtain certification as a multi-employer bargaining unit.<sup>32</sup>

Respondents' concerted action was, however, of a defensive nature, comparable to that of the employers in *NLRB v. Truck Drivers Union, supra*. Their concerted action which resulted in the closings was in response to and in preparation for dealing with the demands of the sales employees.<sup>33</sup> Such cooperation by employers, prior to being

<sup>30</sup> (Citations and footnotes omitted.)

<sup>31</sup> *NLRB v. Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.*, 340 F.2d 690, 693 (2d Cir. 1965).

<sup>32</sup> Respondents raise, in effect, a question of primary jurisdiction, suggesting that the Commission should defer questions of labor law to the National Labor Relations Board. (Reply brief at p. 170.) However, "the outer limits of the labor sphere ought not to be defined solely by a labor agency; the Board, charged with implementing one of a number of competing policies, is ill-suited to determine where it breaks off and others take over." Cox, *Labor and the Antitrust Laws: Pennington and Jewel Tea*, 46 Boston U.L. Rev. 317, 328 (1966).

<sup>33</sup> Such cooperation among relatively small employers faced with a unionization campaign apparently is not unusual. Miller, *Antitrust Laws and Employee Relations* (1984) at 15:

Cooperation among employers in connection with collective bargaining is a common phenomenon. Such cooperation may range from merely participating in wage surveys or other exchanges of information regarding wages, fringe benefits, and the like, [to] belonging to formal organizations—either certified or voluntarily recognized—which engage in multiemployer bargaining. Federal labor law does not discourage, and may even be said, in certain respects, to encourage such joint bargaining, at least so long as it is clear that the members engaging in the multiemployer bargaining have consented to be a part of, and bound by, such joint efforts.

Although joint bargaining by employers in a given industry in a particular area can result in a monolithic wage and fringe benefit structure, and can be said to create something of a monopoly of the available skilled labor in a particular craft or special field of endeavor, it does not appear that such monopolies are violative of the nation's antitrust laws.



certified by the National Labor Relations Board as a multi-employer bargaining unit, appears to [61] be a requisite for such certification. There must be proof of a history of group bargaining by the employers to obtain such certification. *Rainbo Bread Co.*, 92 N.L.R.B. 181, 182 (1950). Therefore, it has long been the practice that, prior to applying for certification as a multi-employer bargaining unit, employers have conferred concerning uniform counterproposals to union demands. *Jacob Schmidt Brewing Co.*, 93 N.L.R.B. 738 (1951); *L.C. Beauchamp*, 87 N.L.R.B. 23 (1949).<sup>34</sup>

This cooperation among employers to meet workers' demands occurs as part of the bargaining process. The absence of eventual certification by the National Labor Relations Board as a multi-employer bargaining unit, or of a final written collective bargaining agreement, fails to change the nature and intent of this activity. The respondents' concerted action and uniform closings also were in response to the demands of sales employees and their unions in a labor dispute, in the context of informal collective bargaining. The concessions made by the dealers inure to the benefit of the employees (F. 119, 197, 241, 286-87) no less than if the parties had reached that provision in a formal written agreement following bona fide arm's-length bargaining. *Mackey v. National Football League*, 543 F.2d 606, 616 (8th Cir. 1976), *cert. dismissed*, 434 U.S. 801 (1977). Therefore, the absence of certification of the concerted activity of respondents as a multi-employer bargaining unit should not prevent the application of the labor exemption.

### 5. Effect

The evidence is clear that the impact of the combination here is greater on labor concerns than on competitive concerns. The uniform shortening of hours of operation directly responded to the concerns of the sales employees (F. 242), exactly as the restriction on store hours in *Jewel Tea* responded to the concerns of the butchers.

The effect on competition here is remote. The shorter hours of operation did not increase retail prices of cars sold in the Detroit area. (F. 300.) The only competitive effect is that consumers have been denied a convenience that they otherwise [62] might have had, just as

<sup>34</sup> In *L.C. Beauchamp*, prior to applying for certification as a multi-employer bargaining unit, car dealers and their association in Chico, California cooperated in facing employees' demands. They agreed to bargain as a unit. The association made a survey of wages being paid by its several members and recommended a uniform wage scale be adopted by all of the members. 87 N.L.R.B. at 25. Certification was denied for failure to show that they had actually bargained with the employees.

in *Jewel Tea* where consumers were denied the opportunity to shop for meat in the evenings. This competitive effect is too indirect to outweigh the labor effects of uniform shorter hours of operation.

Any successful labor demand for uniformity will affect competition. So long as the competitive effects flow naturally from the elimination of competition over wages, hours and working conditions, the goals of the antitrust laws must be subordinated to the goals of the labor laws. Here, the competitive effects flow directly from the elimination of competition over hours to meet the employees' demands.

Complaint counsel make an appealing argument that the demand for shorter work weeks could have been resolved through split shifts or on a dealer by dealer basis. But it is contrary to the clear weight of the evidence. (F. 99-102, 120-21, 172, 236-37.) The sales employees had a bona fide belief that shorter work weeks were not possible without uniform shorter hours of operation (F. 103-04, 122, 173), and based their demands on that belief.<sup>35</sup> The competitive effects flowed directly from the dealers' concessions to it.

This case is therefore governed by the holding in *Jewel Tea* and the nonstatutory labor exemption applies.<sup>36</sup>

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Many of the respondents have engaged in agreement, contract or combination, with each other and in concert with sales employees and their union representatives, adopting or adhering to a schedule limiting hours of operation for the sale or lease of motor vehicles, and attempting to persuade and taking action to persuade dealers to adhere to such a schedule.

2. This matter involves or grows out of a labor dispute.

3. The uniform shortening of hours of operation did not cause substantial prejudice or injury to competition or consumers. [63]

4. The respondents did not violate the Federal Trade Commission Act because any injury to competition or consumers caused by their actions was outweighed by the benefits of labor peace resulting from such actions.

5. The actions of the respondents in uniformly shortening the hours of operation of new car dealerships were motivated primarily by labor

<sup>35</sup> "It ought to be enough to give immunity if the [sales employees] reasonably and sincerely believed that the restriction on store hours yielded direct benefits to the [themselves]." Cox, *Labor and the Antitrust Laws: Pennington and Jewel Tea*, 46 Boston U.L. Rev. 317, 326 (1966).

<sup>36</sup> Since the nonstatutory labor exemption applies here, there is no need to consider the statutory labor exemption. *Richards v. Neilsen Freight Lines*, 810 F.2d 898, 904 (9th Cir. 1987).

concerns and had a more direct impact on competition over hours and working conditions than on business competition.

6. The nonstatutory labor exemption to the antitrust laws applies to the concerted activity of respondents setting uniform operating hours for the sale of cars in the Detroit area.<sup>37</sup>

The complaint, therefore, must be dismissed.

#### OPINION OF THE COMMISSION

BY OLIVER, *Chairman*:

The question presented in this case is whether an agreement among new car dealers in the Detroit metropolitan area to close dealer showrooms on Saturdays and on three weekday evenings is an unlawful restraint of trade. The respondents are the Detroit Auto Dealers Association, Inc. ("DADA"), its executive vice president, several line associations (groups of dealers selling the same make of car), numerous dealerships, and numerous individual owners and operators of dealerships.

The complaint, issued on December 20, 1984, charges that the respondents' agreement to keep showrooms closed all day Saturday and on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday evenings is an unfair method of competition in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. 45.<sup>1</sup> Administrative hearings in 1986 produced over 5,000 pages of testimony and almost 4,000 exhibits. On July 14, 1987, Administrative Law Judge James P. Timony issued his initial decision. He dismissed the complaint, finding that the hours restriction was immune from antitrust scrutiny by virtue of the nonstatutory labor exemption to the antitrust laws. The ALJ also found that the agreement had only a remote and insignificant effect on competition. Complaint counsel appeal, contending that the ALJ stretched the nonstatutory labor exemption beyond its accepted limits

<sup>37</sup> Other issues are raised in the briefs of the parties. The Administrative Procedure Act provides that initial decisions shall include a statement of findings and conclusions, and the reasons or basis therefor, on all the material issues of fact, law, or discretion presented on the record. 5 U.S.C. 557(c)(3). The agency, however, is only required to make findings of fact on those points relevant to settling the controversy before it. *Deep South Broadcasting Co. v. FCC*, 278 F.2d 264, 266 (D.C. Cir. 1960); *Community & Johnson Corp. v. United States*, 156 F. Supp. 440, 443 (D.N.J. 1957).

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 5 of the complaint, which charged that respondents enforced the showroom hours agreement through acts of violence and intimidation, was dismissed without opposition at the close of complaint counsel's case-in-chief for lack of evidence linking such acts to the respondents. Count II, which charged that respondents agreed to restrict the advertising of new cars, was settled by consent agreement with some respondents and dismissed as to other respondents. Those parts of the complaint are not involved in this appeal.