

Delegates Report on Washington Trip

Over 100 delegates representing U.E. members from all parts of the U.S.A. arrived in Washington Monday, June 11, to contact Washington officials on economic matters affecting our membership, and other pending legislation.

John Green, Recording Secretary, and William Stewart, Executive Board member, represented U.E. Local 301. The Schenectady delegates will make a detailed report at the July membership meeting.

Green and Stewart reported that the delegation was divided into small committees, which were assigned to contact certain officials, who were in responsible positions in government, to discuss the U. E. position on all important matters.

Stewart was on a six man committee which met with Vice-President Barkley. Green was on a committee, which was to meet with Charles Wilson on the question of manpower. However, Wilson was not available, and the committee met with Dr. Fleming, Wilson's assistant.

Both Green and Stewart met with Vice-President Kerr of the War Stabilization Board and J. Dunlop, public members, and discussed the G.E. case that was pending before the W.S.B. awaiting approval. Both members of the W.S.B. promised the Schenectady delegates that action would be taken on the G.E. case Tuesday, June 12th.

Both delegates contacted Senators Ives and Lehman and Congressman Kearney.

The delegates who interviewed Senator Bricker from Ohio claimed that Murray and James Carey of the C.I.O. were in favor of a wage freeze. Both delegates have a considerable amount of detailed data to report to the membership. The information which they have is extremely important and members should try to be present at the July membership meeting to hear the report and ask questions.

U.E. Wins Increase for Salem Workers

Salem, Mass.—A new contract was signed by U.E. Local 279 and the Atwood and Morrill Company in Salem, Mass.

The agreement provides for a general wage increase of 10 cents an hour, and also correction of wage inequities, which adds 2 cents to 20 cents an hour to present rates. The local union can reopen on wages in 90 days. A minimum job rate of 1.40 per hour was established. Improved seniority provisions and other contractual gains were made.

CONGRESSMAN DRIPP

BY YOMEN



"Anyone can make a slip in a speech dear. Everyone knows you were denouncing wage increases, not price increases."

Legislators Battle Anti-Inflation Law

The battle of the American people against big business efforts to prevent Congress from enacting legislation to control inflation is now in its final phase.

Both the House and Senate Banking Committees are drafting legislation to continue and replace the Defense Production Act which is due to expire June 30th. What kind of a law will develop is somewhat of a mystery. In any event the Senate voted down a proposal to merely extend the present act, which is a victory for the people. The U.E. position is that we need a strong law to prevent further price increases.

Lobbyists for the National Association of Manufacturers, the cattle industry and other special interest groups are still pressuring Congress to kill controls on prices. It is certain that many attempts will be made to cripple the new act with weakening amendments.

The strength of the drive by big business is reflected in a tally of the testi-

mony at hearings before the two committees. Those favoring controls were given the brushoff, while spokesmen for the NAM, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and their front organizations were allowed to run wild. A total of 76 witnesses against controls appeared, while only 14 testified for the consumers' side.

Since a new law now appears likely, foes of controls have considered the strategy of enacting so many amendments that the President would have to veto the legislation as "unworkable." Legislators, remembering how their similar maneuvering worked when price controls were killed prematurely in 1946, may try this approach.

NOTICE TO SHOP STEWARDS

Make sure to appoint an alternate while on vacation. Send or call in to the Union office the name and check number of your alternate, along with the foreman to which you are assigned.

ELECTRICAL UNION NEWS

THE VOICE OF THE UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO & MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA — LOCAL 301, UE.

Vol. 9 — No. 13

SCHENECTADY, NEW YORK

Friday, July 6, 1951

U. E. Wins More Elections

In an N.L.R.B. election at the General Cable plant in Rome, N. Y., held on Wednesday, June 27, the U.E. gave the I.U.E. a terrific beating at the polls, resulting in a 3 to 1 victory for the U.E.

With the usual red baiting propaganda and with the help of 40 outside organizers under the leadership of Frank Fiorillo and Martin Stanton, the I.U.E. besieged the City of Rome, using full page ads in the local newspaper and radio and television time on the air. Their campaign of threats and lies was not accepted by the General Cable workers, as was expressed in the outcome of the election:

U.E. — 860
I.U.E. — 316

Another victory over the I.U.E. took place in Canada, where the government conducted an election among the Peterboro General Electric workers. The I.U.E. had petitioned at the Canadian G.E. plant a year ago. Their petition was thrown out by the government when it was proved that many of the applications cards had forged names on them. The I.U.E. petitioned again this year and the U.E. agreed to an election in order to settle the dispute. The result was:

U.E. — 1900
I.U.E. — 1500

Another election took place at a Westinghouse plant in Sonnyville, California, which was formerly represented by the I.B.E.W., A. F. of L. The results were:

U.E. — 190
I.B.E.W. — 160

Buffalo, N. Y.—Workers of the Markel Electric Local 326, UE, voted for a union shop in an election here Wednesday by 241 to 3.

Baltimore, Md.—It took two NLRB elections for General Electric workers in the Locke Insulator plant here to be able to win the union of their choice: UE won out over IUE in the second NLRB election here Friday by a vote of 473 for UE to 150 for IUE. The "neither" vote was 214 due to unprecedented campaign by company.

This is the second UE victory in a short time. On January 16, 1951 UE defeated IUE. (Continued on Page 4)

Legislative Committee Displays Food Exhibit

The Legislative Committee of Local 301 displayed a food exhibit showing an increase in food prices since last year. Using 12 items of groceries and meats, the committee proved price increases of 31%.

The items used in the exhibit were:

	June 9, 1950	July 1, 1951 (increase)
1. Bread	14c per loaf	18c per loaf
2. Butter	59c per lb.	84c per lb.
3. Sugar	39c — 5 lbs.	45c — 5 lbs.
4. Coffee	73c per lb.	90c per lb.
5. Pepper	14c — 1 oz.	23c — 1 oz.
6. Soap Chips (Giant).....	65c per pkg.	79c per pkg.
7. Potatoes	41c — 10 lbs.	70c — 10 lbs.
8. Oranges	39c — 1 doz.	49c — 1 doz.
9. Steak	79c per lb.	1.12 per lb.
10. Flour	47c — 5 lbs.	51c — 5 lbs.
11. Soap Chips (Small).....	27c per pkg.	32c per pkg.
12. Cheese	79c — 2 lbs.	1.03 — 2 lbs.
	5.76	7.56

The committee reported that they will meet with the City Council and Board of Supervisors to solicit their support in trying to get a price roll back for the community.

The committee also will meet with the heads of the retail and wholesale merchants in town and urge them to support the program.

The food that was used for the exhibit was given away in two prizes. The members attending both the afternoon and evening meetings were given numbers. Albert Van Der Zee, President of the Pension Club, drew the lucky numbers. William J. Snyder and Albert Rossi were the winners.

We Want U.E. Contract Says I.U.E.

In a letter to L. R. Boulware, Vice-President of General Electric, James Carey demanded from the Company that the contract provisions, which are already in the U. E. contract, be given to him in the coming contract negotiations between the I.U.E. and General Electric.

According to the reply made by Boulware, Carey wanted to pull a fast deal with the G.E. in exchange for a Union Shop agreement, similar to the deal he made with the Westinghouse Corporation on June 1st, by extending his present contract without improvements and signing it without the consent of the membership. The Union Shop requires his members to remain members of the Union or lose their jobs.

Not being able to work the same at G.E., he demands the next best thing, the

I.U.E. Lose Case at Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory

The I.U.E.-C.I.O. received their reply from the Davis Panel on their demands for an increase with automatic progression and a change in schedule of hours.

The committee denied everything except a change in work schedule, which resulted in ¼ hour for lunch instead of 1 hour.

The U.E. has been in the process of negotiating the work schedule at K-1 at the Knolls. Management has agreed to establish the ½ hour lunch period in K-1 if the U.E. members want it.

same contract provisions as the U.E. has. Even Boulware could not understand this. In his letter to Carey, he says, you wanted a contract completely different than the U.E. (See the Boulware letter to Carey on inside pages.)

GENERAL  ELECTRIC

EMPLOYEE RELATIONS NEWS LETTER

For Circulation Among General Electric Management

June 22, 1951

IUE NEGOTIATIONS

This week—90 days ahead of the September 15 deadline—we received the formal notice of IUE's intention to cancel the present contract and of the union's desire to begin negotiations promptly on a new one.

Familiar economic demands are for an escalator, for a profit-sharing or so-called "productivity" arrangement, for lay-off and separation allowances and for the Company to absorb the 2 per cent now paid by employees toward their pensions.

Beside some other customary demands, there also are 14 pages of contract changes, some of them taken almost verbatim from the previous UE contract and from the current UE one. Our reply was as follows:

June 21, 1951

Dear Mr. Carey:

This will acknowledge your letter of June 16 formally notifying the Company of your intention to terminate the present GE-IUE(CIO) National Agreement next September 15th. You also make the now familiar old demands in connection with a proposed new agreement, and suggest that we have our first negotiating meeting on June 26.

Previous commitments make us unavailable for an initial meeting on June 26th, but we can be here on the 29th or on any day except Monday during the week of July 9th.

But, if we have such an early meeting, we feel it should be largely for planning the sessions we can hold later in the summer in the light of the mature facts available at that time. We both understand each other on the old familiar non-economic demands you make, and our principal problem in these negotiations is going to be the arriving at a mutually satisfactory determination as to what, if anything, should be done in the economic area. Because of the obviously fluid state of the economic and governmental factors involved, it is our opinion that both you and we will be far better able to arrive at sound conclusions much later in the summer when definite facts are more readily available to us.

Because of the considerations indicated above, it will be our proposal that after preliminary discussions of whatever duration appears to be profitable, the negotiations should adjourn until the latter part of August, at which time both you and we will be in a position to negotiate a new agreement with more accurate knowledge of

the economic conditions which will be current at the time any new agreement is to go into effect.

Incidentally, we are a little surprised at your outward desire now to terminate the contract with which you expressed such satisfaction only 6 weeks ago. You will recall that you were then seeking to extend the contract in its present form if we would agree to your economic proposals and especially if we would fix it immediately so that a renewal of the contract would bar other unions from seeking elections to get back the representation rights you had won a year ago and, again, if we would arrange it so that employees would be forced by us, through a Union Shop agreement, to join and remain members of your union in order to be permitted to hold jobs at General Electric.

But we are even more surprised that certain of your proposed contract provisions seem copied almost verbatim from the contract previously in effect between the Company and the union which formerly represented those employees you now represent and which provisions were modified during our extended negotiations with you last summer. This seems to be a radical change now from your frequently expressed desire last year to have your contract as completely different as possible from the former one you had so condemned along with the union which had negotiated it.

We can't help but recall your telling us only last month that the Company ought to reconcile itself to agreeing to your demands voluntarily since, as you asserted, you would be able to have the Wage Stabilization Board in Washington rule in your favor on these demands. In view of this indication that you are apparently coming to the bargaining table with the plan and hope of ultimately having any negotiating differences presented to some governmental agency after any necessary strike action, and in view also of your statement at our last meeting that you don't propose to spend much time in negotiation, we feel we are entitled to some doubts about our negotiations being very fruitful.

Nevertheless, we shall approach these negotiations, as we always do, with the genuine desire to arrive at what is fair for all concerned. Certainly our every effort will be in that direction.

If you will let us know your wishes about the dates suggested, we will arrange accordingly.

Yours very truly,

L. R. Boulware

**EMPLOYEE RELATIONS DIVISION
NEW YORK**