

One group of assembly workers was on a 4-day per week schedule while next to it others were on a 6-day schedule. In Louisville, it was freely admitted by management that there was considerable overtime in the early part of 1960 followed by heavy drastic layoffs.

A report from Burlington shows layoff of women taking place while others were working nearly 6 to 7 days a week.

The only argument by management is a claim that emergencies frequently make it necessary to schedule overtime operations and that in these situations it would be impracticable to call people back for short periods of work. Our proposal takes account of this. All we need do is to define what an emergency is or the conditions under which people would be called back in lieu of overtime.

We need only have an agreement that the principle is a desirable one in order to write language which is practical and mutually beneficial.

**SUB and Termination Pay**

As is well known, general economic conditions do have an influence on the level of employment. But these economic conditions in turn are influenced by the policies followed by employers—of which General Electric is one of the largest in the country. Thus, GE cannot escape its responsibility by simply blaming downturns in employment on "economic conditions."

Furthermore, as we showed convincingly in our June 13 and June 19 statements, sales do not necessarily make jobs and large scale investments rather than creating jobs may, with the wrong kind of policies actually reduce employment.

The argument of General Electric that our proposals would have resulted in less Employment Security is simply a bogey to try to frighten us, and is without merit. GE's record in this field is so bad as compared with the rest of the electrical industry that it is not possible to conceive that it could have been worse.

As we have repeatedly declared, SUB and termination pay are not substitutes for employment or employment stabilization. Like unemployment compensation, they are measures to provide an income to employees when all efforts at employment security and employment stabilization have failed. The greatest gap in our GE program of benefits is the failure to provide proper benefits to employees who are laid off through no fault of their own.

We are unable to understand the statements of management with regard to these necessary measures.

No real arguments or evidence were presented by General Electric to justify opposition to their incorporation into our National Agreement.

The facts are very clear—that these programs have been adopted by the largest part of the durable goods manufacturing industry of which General Electric is a part. All evidence has indicated that they are operating successfully even though many of the plants do not have as substantial a plan as the IUE proposes.

There have been no indications of any attempt on the part of either labor or management, where such plans have been introduced, to eliminate them. Rather, the plans have been continued, liberalized and improved.

As the evidence presented during these hearings clearly shows, in only a few cases are em-

ployees able to get unemployment compensation equal to even the inadequate 50% of wages that General Electric declares is its goal. Benefits are very far behind the 60% to 65% that the Federal Advisory Committee on Social Security of the U.S. Government and the U.S. Department of Labor have indicated are reasonable goals.

It is impossible to understand why General Electric can so vigorously favor, as it claims, increased unemployment compensation and then be opposed to supplements to unemployment compensation where they are clearly inadequate. The principle is the same—the money is paid to laid off employees from a pooled fund. The contributions are the same—they are made by an employer to a pool fund.

The argument—that the monies are paid only to laid off people—has equal validity to unemployment compensation. It has equal validity to the situation with regard to pensions and insurance holidays and vacations. They, too, are paid only to certain groups of employees.


The evidence is clear also that to the extent that SUB provides additional purchasing power during a downturn, it helps maintain income and prevent downturns from spiraling into full fledged depressions. To that extent, they do provide for the maintenance of jobs. General Electric itself has benefited greatly from the sustenance to purchasing power provided through SUB payments by other companies.

This may be of special importance in 1961 when, according to all expectations, another recession is likely to occur with another substantial downturn in employment.

The same arguments apply with equal force to termination pay. The record shows that possibly 13,000 GE employees in our units have been terminated through the moving out of jobs, automation, through the contracting-out of work, etc.

Where it appears perfectly clear through a long layoff that the employee is unlikely to return to his job, termination pay has been found by the largest durable goods industries to be the proper method to enable him to make an adjustment and provide the community with this purchasing power during this period of long layoff.

Until a better proposal is made to assure a decent income to laid off employees and to those terminated, we must insist on the adoption of the SUB and termination pay.



**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. Schaffer
Asst. Recording Secretary	David Gunn
Chief Shop Steward	Joseph Mangino
Business Agent	Leo Jandreau
121 Erie Blvd.	Schenectady 5, N. Y.
Editor	Art Christopher

# LOCAL 301 NEWS

## IUE AFL-CIO

**STEWARDS ATTEND CLASSES IN PREPARATION FOR OCT. 1960**

Officers, Executive Board Members and Stewards of Local 301, IUE, turned out last Tuesday and Wednesday to attend the 2-day Educational Program sponsored by the Local in cooperation with the International IUE.

Ben Segal, International IUE Educational Director, conducted a group of four classes over the two-day period in an intensive program to help prepare the leaders and membership of Local 301, IUE, for the coming months ahead.

"Preparedness" was the theme of the sessions which covered "1960 Negotiations", "Lines of Communications", "The Union Program for 1960", and "Public Speaking"...other subjects were also touched upon during the two days.

This was the final session of a program which was started back in the early part of 1959 and continued at regular intervals until the present time in an effort to prepare the membership of the Local for the 1960 negotiations.

During all these sessions, not one hour of lost time was charged to the Local...all classes being attended voluntarily on the student's own time.

Due to the enthusiasm created by a program such as this, future classes will probably be planned in Leadership Training.

**LAST WEEK'S WINNERS--WSNY**

**EARLY RISERS' CLUB**

- |                 |                    |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| Steve Jankowski | Pat J. Donato      |
| John Judosko    | C.F. Schermerhorn  |
| Mona Alkinburgh | Mrs. Tom McGrath   |
| Louis Kmetz     | Mrs. George Fry    |
| Tom Miller      | Pat Youngs         |
| Ed Nejman       | Mrs. Lee Hansett   |
| Eleanor Capra   | Bernice Drozdowski |
| Mrs. John Fodor |                    |

The Jackpot Winner for last week was Tom Miller.

**WELDERS WANTED!**

WHERE: Naval Base, Portsmouth, N.H.

(approx. 250 miles from) Schenectady

RATE: Welder with 4 yrs. exper.

Start	- \$2.54
6 mo.	- 2.64
18 mo.	- 2.74

(.19¢ premium for nights)

Welder with 2 yrs. exper. approx. 20¢ hr. less.

HOW: Obtain Form #57 from any Post Office.

Can be permanent job.

Must pass X-ray Test.

Overhead and vertical hard wire similar to stainless steel.

If you cannot pass first test, you can take another one after 3 days. Must wait 30 days to take 3rd test.

**JANDREAU ON WSNY TONIGHT  
7:00 P.M.**

Leo Jandreau, Business Agent of Local 301 of the IUE, will appear in person on WSNY this evening at 7:00 p.m., to answer questions from the listening audience concerning the 1960 negotiations between the Union and the G.E. Co.

The program, "Community Roundtable", is sponsored by the G.E. Co. and runs from 7-7:30 p.m. each weekday evening. The number to call is EXpress 3-3622...Steve Fitz, moderator on the program will answer the phone and relay the question to Leo Jandreau.

Robert Buckley, representing G.E., appeared on the same program last Monday evening and answered questions on the same subject.