

VACATION "GIVEAWAY" TICKETS
AVAILABLE

The 1960 Vacation "Giveaway" tickets are now in the hands of your Board Members and Shop Stewards...be sure to get yours before the supply runs out.

The Local 301 Activities Committee has launched the first of its many activities planned for 1960. The "Giveaway" was resumed this year by popular demand and they will endeavor to duplicate the same prizes as those given away last year. They are:

1st prize--Ocean Voyage (Bermuda, etc.) or \$600.00

2nd prize--2 weeks vacation for family or \$250.00

3rd prize--1 week's vacation for family or \$150.00

All proceeds from the sale of tickets will be applied towards the Children's Christmas Party for 1960 provided Local 301 is not forced out on strike in October. If so, then this money will be deposited in a Local 301 Strike Fund.

However, we hope that by starting negotiations a little earlier this year, we may be able to succeed in obtaining an equitable, peaceful settlement from GE long before the October deadline, and be able to give the kiddies their well-deserved Christmas Party.

"301" MEMBERS FLOOD CONGRESS
WITH LETTERS ON FORAND BILL

In the past week, members of Local 301 have been busy sending letters, postcards and telegrams to their representatives in Washington D.C., urging them to support the "Forand Bill" which would give medical, surgical and nursing care to our older citizens who are now on pension.

These people who have worked hard all their lives to make America what it is today, deserve to be taken care of during the days of their retirement when they are forced to live on a "limited income". Prices continue to rise, bus fares increase, insurance rates, taxes keep going up in line with the rising cost-of-living. Still their incomes remain fixed which places an added hardship on them.

They have reached a stage in life when they are more in need of medical assistance than at any time in their lives. It is our responsibility to see to it that they are taken care of under our Social Security System and not left as victims of a welfare state.

(cont'd. next column)

Editorial:

"LAND OF THE FREE"....

We believe that all American citizens are concerned about democracy or lack of democracy, no matter where it occurs in the world.

We shall tell you of the conditions that some of the people in a certain country have to live under. All the citizens of this country are taxed equally and have to serve equally in the Armed Forces of the country in question. There the equality ends! One segment of the population is not allowed to vote in the elections on the issues concerning the country at election time. Their children are not allowed in the public schools. They are paid less for doing the same work as the rest of the population. This group is not allowed to share the same section of public conveyances and is forced to use separate drinking fountains. If you think we are describing the "untouchables" of India or members of a Leper Colony you have guessed wrong! The above are just some of the ways that United States citizens of the Negro race are treated in the United States and its capital is Washington, D.C.

The Schenectady NAACP is launching a membership drive during the month of May...you can help make America truly the "Land of the Free" by supporting this worth-while organization and becoming a member for 1960

The Forand Bill has been bottled up in the House Ways and Means Committee and has been blocked from reaching the House floor for debate. We feel that if it can be brought out of committee, it will have better than an average chance of passing in this election year. It's now or never!

The only sure way to get this bill out of committee is to urge your representatives in Washington to sign a petition requesting the Ways and Means Committee to release this bill for action.

DON'T DELAY...WRITE TODAY
TOMORROW MAY BE TOO LATE!

SHAMBO TO DISCUSS FORAND BILL
ON "LABOR LOOKS AT THE NEWS"

John Shambo, President of Local 301, will appear on "Labor Looks at the News" this Saturday evening at 6:45 p.m., on WSNY, 1240 on the dial.

Mr. Shambo will discuss the problems of our Senior Citizens relative to the Forand Bill.

Union Members Donate \$600 to YMCA Boys Day-Camp (See Page 4)

LOCAL 301 NEWS

IUE AFL-CIO

Vol. 7 — No. 17 The Voice of GE Workers, Local 301, Schenectady, N. Y. April 29, 1960

ALCO Strike on "Job Security" Settled



LOCAL 301 PENSIONERS crowd IUE Hall to rally support for "Forand Bill" which would render them medical, surgical and nursing aid at a time in life when they are forced to live on a "fixed income".

Scholarship Drive Reaches \$1,177

Late Returns Still Expected

The Local's 2nd Annual Scholarship Fund Drive reached the "successful stage" as a total of \$1,177 was tabulated at the Union Office last week.

All executive board members are urged to contact their Stewards in an effort to get all the final returns in to the Union Office as soon as possible in order that the books may be closed officially.

Scholarship applications will be ready for distribution after May 1st, 1960. A scholastic record, which can be obtained from your High School principal, must accompany each entrant's application in order to determine those most qualified for the annual award. Scholastic ratings, plus the financial need of the applicant

will be a determining factor in the committee's selection. The committee will be assisted by members of the Board of Education as was the practice last year. The size of the scholarship fund will also determine the amount of financial aid the local will be able to offer the winner.

All stewards are urged to get all their final returns in to the Union Office as quickly as possible.

Only students graduating from high school "this year" are eligible.

The two week old strike at the ALCO Plant in Schenectady came to an end this past week as members of Local 2054, United Steelworkers of America, agreed to return to work.

The main issue of the strike was "job security."

According to an article in the Gazette by Bob Barber, a joint statement made by W. H. Allison, manufacturing manager at ALCO and David Danzig, president of the Steelworkers, local, "A large measure of job security for employees at Schenectady" is provided in the new agreement but it was not further spelled out.

JOB SECURITY

It was the job security element in the negotiations which caused the strike. The union insisted on the right of employees to follow their jobs in the event work moved out of Schenectady.

The Company affirmed its intention to maintain its locomotive production in Schenectady. The joint statement also declared that it was the intent of the parties to cooperate in efforts to secure additional locomotive rebuilding work, according to the Gazette.

Many observers hailed the settlement as a possible forerunner to a peaceful settlement between GE and the IUE in the months ahead in which "job security" will be an important issue to union members and to our Community's well being.

"LABOR LOOKS

AT THE NEWS"

Dial 1240 — WSNY

Sponsored by Local 301, IUE
Every Sat. 6:45-7:00 P.M.

YOUR Unemployment Insurance Law

Amendments to the unemployment insurance law approved by the 1960 Legislature, which became effective April 25th, will take away almost certainly \$2 in benefits for every dollar of new benefits called for by the bill.

Raising the maximum benefit rate from \$45 to \$50, without revising the rest of the benefit scale would not add a dime to the payments to 75% of the unemployed—only those who had had regular earnings of \$91 a week and up. Of this group one out of twenty would get \$46, another would get \$47, another would get \$48, another \$49 and the other sixteen would get \$50. The total annual outlay would be \$14,000,000.

But the new and vicious disqualification clause would result in a sure loss of \$9,000,000, and probably as much as \$34,000,000 in benefits to some 72,000 jobless, because in place of a limited period of disqualification, the law will be changed so that the disqualification might easily become indefinite and unending.

WHAT LAW PROMISED

Here is what the law provided in disqualifications up to now. If you (1) quit a job voluntarily without good cause, or (2) refused a job offer without good cause, or (3) were fired for misconduct and this cause was upheld, you would be disqualified for unemployment insurance benefits for six weeks.

However, after serving the disqualification period, plus the normal one-week waiting period, you could receive benefits up to the maximum of 26 weeks, provided you remained unemployed and remained actively on the job market, that is, continued to seek employment and did not refuse a job offer.

Under the new disqualification procedure, if you are in one of these three groups noted above, you will have to either (1) obtain other employment for three days in each of four weeks, or (2) earn \$200.

In addition to these three groups there is another, made up of women who quit a job to be married or who are already married and quit to go to a new location to be with their husband and family. Court tests of such cases had resulted in findings that quitting a job under such circumstances constituted good cause, and therefore such applicants were not penalized by having to serve a disqualification period.

Despite this fact, these workers, too, now are disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance

benefits until they, too, have gotten other employment three days in each of four weeks or have earned \$200.

And if enough time elapses before you get new employment, even though you then worked long enough or earned enough to end the disqualification, you could still be denied benefits. Here's how that would work.

DISQUALIFICATION

You've been disqualified. Eventually you manage to get other work and end the disqualification. But because of the elapsed time, you find that on again becoming unemployed you do not have the required 20 weeks of work in the preceding 52 weeks, or 40 weeks of work in the 104 weeks preceding your application, which still are needed for your benefit claim to be paid.

Even wiping out the original disqualification could become an impossibility. For example, the development of a new recession, or the arrival of a slack season, employment affected by a change in the weather, or in styles or in method of manufacture, each could mean extended disqualification and therefore the total and absolute loss of right to unemployment insurance benefits.

To realize the shrinkage of job opportunities today compared to only a few years ago, consider these facts:

Item—unemployment as long as 15 weeks hit 14.4% of the unemployed in 1951; in 1959, the percentage was 27.3%. Both were "prosperous" years.

Item—the unemployed in 1951 were only 3.1% of the total labor force; in 1959 they were 5.5% of the total.

Item—New York State averaged 244,000 unemployed per week in 1951; in 1959 the average was 307,000.

Item—In 1956 there were in New York State no major areas of "substantial labor surplus," that is, where 6% or more of the work force was jobless, and there was only one smaller area like this. In March, 1960, last month, there were three such major areas in the State (one was the Schenectady-Albany-Troy Area) where unemployment exceeded 6% and there were nine smaller areas.

Item—in 1956 the number of workers who exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits was 69,224; in 1959, the number was 176,532.

Item—nearly all economists predict another recession in 1961, and

the official publication of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce itself, "The Nation's Business," said this in the April, 1960, issue: "It seems premature to predict a recession within the next year to 18 months seems likely."

HARSHER REQUIREMENTS

All of these factors make it clear that finding a new job will continue to be far more difficult than it was a few years ago. And the vastly harsher requirements for ending disqualification for unemployment insurance benefits, bad as they are, will hit workers with even greater force than they would otherwise.

So, naturally, you ask yourself this question:

Which members of the Legislature, the Assembly and State Senate, voted to make this sandbagging of workers possible? Was my Assemblyman or State Senator one of them?

Let's call the roll and see who voted for this bill:

In Albany County—Assemblyman Harvey Lifset and Senator Julian B. Erway, both Democrats. (The only Democrats, incidentally, who voted for this bill).

In Montgomery County—Assemblyman Donald A. Campbell and Senator Walter Van Wiggeren, both Republicans.

In Herkimer County—Assemblyman Leo A. Lawrence and Senator Walter Van Wiggeren, both Republicans.

In Schoharie County—Assemblyman Russell Selkirk (R).

In Warren County—Assemblyman Richard T. Bartlett and Senator Gilbert T. Seelye, both Republicans.

In Fulton County—Senator Walter Van Wiggeren.

On the roll of those who voted (Continued on Page 4)

LOCAL 301 IUE NEWS AFL-CIO

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF LOCAL 301, REPRESENTING SCHENECTADY GE WORKERS

Published by the Editorial Committee
 President John H. Shambo
 Vice President William J. Kelly
 Treasurer Pat J. Donato
 Recording Secretary ... Roy V. Schaffar
 Ass't Recording Secretary.. David Gunn
 Chief Shop Steward ... Joseph Mangino
 Business Agent Leo Jandreau
 121 Erie Blvd., Schenectady 5, N. Y.

Editor — Art Christopher

Health Care Bill Gets Congress Support

A major breakthrough appeared

in the making on health care protection for the aged through social security, as compromise proposals reportedly gained ground in the House Ways & Means Committee—apparently with strong backing from Speaker Sam Rayburn (D-Tex.) and Chairman Wilbur Mills (D-Aark.).

As Congress continued to react to mounting public demand for legislation along the lines of the AFL-CIO-backed Forand bill, Vice Pres. Nixon broke his long silence on the issue and openly opposed the measure, characterizing it as "compulsory health insurance."

For months, sources close to Nixon's presidential campaign pictured the Vice President as having waged a strong, but losing, fight within the Administration for a Forand-type bill that would gear health benefits to the nation's social security machinery.

The Ways & Means Committee—which several weeks ago rejected the original bill introduced by Rep. Aime J. Forand (D-R. I.) by a 17-8 vote—has been meeting almost daily in an effort to find a compromise that would still contain Forand's social security principle.

Limited to Hospital Care

The bill said to be making strong headway in committee would be limited to 60 days of hospital care a year for persons drawing retirement benefits, as compared with Forand's broader benefits including surgical and nursing home care for all social security beneficiaries.

The cost of the program would be financed by raising the base wages on which social security taxes are levied on both employers and employees from the present \$4,800 a year to \$6,000. The Forand bill called for an additional tax of one-quarter of 1 percent annually—raising the costs to employers and employees by \$12 a year each.

Members of Local 301 are still continuing to pour letters, postcards and telegrams to their representatives in Washington urging support of the "Forand Bill" . . . asking that a petition be signed to get the Bill out of committee and on the house floor for debate.

"Things to Think About"

By Frank Masterson

1ST CLASS CITIZEN

A salute to Donald Wagschal, 2nd shift, #273, under Board Member Joe Alois! Don's donation of \$10.00 to the Scholarship Fund is the largest single donation we have received. Thank you, Don.

WASHINGTON, APRIL 6TH, NEWS BULLETIN

Headlines and caption states: Dirkson gives Jim Carey furious tongue lashing . . . Dirckson calls Carey "Insane" on aged bill.

This is what the headline reads and many of us see, but for those who read the whole article, they will find that Jim Carey made his statements in gentlemanly manner and his statements had sound basic reasoning . . . and that, it was Sen. Dirkson who appeared to be mentally unbalanced with his actions and statements and he was reprimanded by his colleagues for his attitude unbecoming a senator of the United States. Sen. Dirkson has voted against labor right down the line.

Comments on Article Appearing in the Pittsfield G. E. News ("The Berkshires Look at Beacon Hill")

State of Massachusetts . . . Senate Bill 2530. This bill provides unemployment payments after employees have been out on strike after six weeks. This the G. E. says is the worst thing that can happen to business in Massachusetts. In effect, they say . . . how can we starve the people into submission if the State will allow them to collect unemployment compensation?

This bill was defeated by G. E. propaganda. Once again they hold the club of financial disaster over people who have the courage and convictions to fight for what they believe in.

AFTER READING VICTOR RIESEL'S column on the meeting at Lynn, Mass. with Jack Parker and G. E. management, it seems to me it follows a pattern. If you bow your head and subject yourselves to the will of the Company, a few crumbs will fall your way. BUT, if you maintain your pride and fight for what is rightfully yours and what you believe in, THEY WILL LOWER THE BOOM!

Let us not be worried about Riesel's remarks about keeping the gates open . . . this is not new at G. E. . . . they were open 9 weeks in '46! If all the employees at G.E. realize that we will fight the fight if necessary and that all of us will receive the benefits, I am sure they will honor our picket lines and support our position to the best of their ability.

DON'T BE HEADLINE READERS . . . read the complete article thoroughly. If you don't understand an article completely, you can get the answer by attending your membership meetings.



MAKE IT A DATE!

Attend Your Union Meeting