

# **OEIU Wins Reversal of NLRB Teamster Ruling in US Supreme Court**



Joseph E. Finley, General Counsel of the OEIU, who argued the International's case before the United States Supreme Court.

### **OEIU** Supreme Court Victory May **Open Door to Other Gains for Labor**

IN winning its battle in the the law and have been left to protection of the law to the ployers., This has made new thousands of employes of labor organizing very difficult and unions who are represented by has seriously weakened unions the OEIU, the door may be in many plants. opened for a significant triumph "While we cannot be sure for the entire labor movement, until a proper case comes according to Joseph E. Finley, along," Mr. Finley said, "the Board, loser in the Local 11 case from Portland, Oreg., which the Supreme Court decided May 6, 1957, has received its first important legal setback in its use of broad disover cases. The NLRB's current jurisdictional standards, where it sets certain dollar volumes for businesses as a measure of jurisdiction, have been under attack from labor for some time. The Board's yardsticks have of employes in many industries have been denied protection of

U.S. Supreme Court to bring the mercies of anti-labor em-

# **Reversal by High Court of NLRB Ruling Has Far-Reaching Import**

THE Office Employes International Union has won its long fight in the courts for the right to bargain for the thousands of employes who work for labor unions. The U. S. Supreme Court, on May 6, 1957, ruled in Office Employes International Union, Local No. 11 v. NLRB, that the Board must take jurisdiction over unions when acting as employers, thus guaranteeing to every person who works for a labor union the full protection of the national labor law.

Local 11 in Portland, Oreg., filed unfair labor practice charges against the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and several of its affiliates in 1953, charging that the Teamsters as employers had committed a whole series of unfair labor practices against the clericals who worked for them. An NLRB Trial Examiner found that the Teamsters violated every employer unfair labor practice provision in the law, and ordered full legal protection, with reinstatements and back pay, for the office clericals represented by Local 11. The NLRB, in a 3-to-2 vote in 1955, held that it would not take jurisdiction over unions when acting as employers, thus removing protection of the law from all the union employes represented by the OEIU.

#### Instructions from the President

Because of the importance of this case to the OEIU and its members, President Coughlin instructed attorney Joseph E. Finley, General Counsel of the OEIU, to appeal to the courts to seek a reversal of this NLRB ruling. The case was taken to the U.S. Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia, and in 1956, that court upheld the NLRB, stating that the Board had broad discretion in deciding whether or not to hear cases brought before it.

"It looked like we were about finished then," said Mr. Finley, "since our only hope to reverse this improper ruling was in the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court is very selective about what cases it will hear and turns down about 13 cases to every one it accepts. Many labor attorneys told us we didn't have a chance of getting the Supreme Court to take our case. President Coughlin and I both felt we had a chance and we decided to go all the way."

The OEIU's next move was to file a petition in the Supreme Court asking the high tribunal to hear the case. Mr. Finley filed his brief last September, arguing to the Supreme Court that it ought to take the case because of its public importance. Last November, the Court granted the OEIU petition and placed the case on the docket for argument. Mr. Finley then wrote a legal brief stating that the NLRB and the Court of Appeals were wrong and then argued the case before the nine justices on March 28, 1957. The NLRB fought the case all the way, and the Teamsters filed a 105-page written brief in the Supreme Court arguing that they should not be covered by the law.

The Supreme Court decision was a total victory for the OEIU. A majority of five justices, in an opinion by Justice Tom C. Clark, held that the NLRB was compelled under law to take

General Counsel of the OEIU. Supreme Court used language The National Labor Relations in its decision in the OEIU case that is causing many labor attorneys and possibly even the NLRB itself to seriously question the legality of the Board's jurisdictional standards. The Court pointed out that it was cretion in taking jurisdiction neither approving nor disapproving of this NLRB action,

but the words it used indicated that it would want to think a the Board the wide power it claims."

(Continued on page 2)

jurisdiction over cases where unions were the employers. This was the heart of the Court's ruling, and it was this holding that secures the legal rights of all the employes of unions who are represented by the OEIU.

#### **Point of Agreement by Justices**

Four of the justices would not go so far as to hold that the Board was compelied under law to take jurisdiction, but even they agreed the NLRB and the Court of Appeals were both wrong in holding that jurisdiction could be declined over unions as employers because unions are non-profit organizations. This was the reasoning used by the NLRB when it originally decided the case, and a 2-to-1 majority of the Court of Appeals approved that standard. Thus, nine justices were unanimous in telling the Board and the Court of Appeals that this was improper.

"We were shooting to establish a very difficult legal point," Mr. Finley said. "There was not a single important case in the country to support us. The NLRB had won every significant case in the courts where its right to set up its own rules of jurisdiction was questioned. long time before it would grant Now, for the first time, the Supreme Court has told the NLRB that it must take jurisdiction over a class of employers."

The Supreme Court opinion reflected the arguments presented by the OEIU. Section 2 (2) The refusal of the NLRB to of the Taft-Hartley Act included unions as employers "when acting as employers." Despite take jurisdiction over thousands this clear language, the NLRB said it could treat unions like any other employers and use its been set so high that thousands of employers engaged in inter- broad discretion whether to take a case or not. The Supreme Court pointed out that Congress, state commerce has caused a when the original Wagner Act was passed in 1935, indicated that it wanted union employers (Continued on page 2)



Subscription Price \$1 a Year

**OEIU** Convention

in the United States and Canada to be represented at the coming

Living Costs Rise

The Consumer Price Index published by the Bureau of Labor

Statistics indicates another increase of 0.2 per cent for the month

ending March 15, 1957. This marks the seventh straight month

that the cost of living has risen. The Labor Department spokes-

by virtue of escalator clauses contained in their agreements, mil-

lions of office and clerical employes will not so benefit. This

While a number of workers will receive automatic increases

man predicts another increase for the month of April.

ton, beginning June 10, 1957.

convention.

previous year.

#### **OEIU Wins** (Continued from page 1)

covered by the law. Justice Clark wrote that for the NLRB to put unions in the same class with other non-profit organizations was "entirely unrealistic." In summarizing its ruling, the majority said, "We therefore conclude that the Board's declination of jurisdiction was contrary to the intent of Congress, was arbitrary and was beyond its power."

Although the Trial Examiner had found the Teamsters guilty of almost every unfair labor practice known, and even one new one not ever before found against any employer, the NLRB did not rule on the merits of the unfair labor practice charges because it refused to take jurisdiction. As a result of the Supreme Court decision, the case now goes back to the NLRB for that agency to now make findings on the unfair labor practice charges. It is believed that the Board will have no hesitancy in finding for the OEIU on this score.

"The Supreme Court decision establishes the legal principle that we have always fought for," said Mr. Finley. "Employes of unions now have the full protection of the law and have the full strength of the OEIU to fight for them. Naturally we are all very pleased to win this victory for the OEIU."

#### **May Open Door**

(Continued from page 1)

major controversy in the labor field today. State courts had attempted to fill the void by assuming jurisdiction, usually is-The Seventh Convention of the Office Employes International suing anti-labor injunctions Union will be held in Minneapolis, Minn., at the Hotel Learningagainst union efforts. On March 25, 1957, the Supreme The OEIU prides itself in being a truly democratic organiza-Court ruled that states could tion. Our Constitution is a model for democratic unions. Long not take jurisdiction over labor before the Taft-Hartley Act, our International Union supplied activities which affected comregular quarterly financial reports to its local unions. We conmerce, thus creating a vast "noduct elections for International Union office by secret ballot. man's land" where no jurisdic-Any delegate who raises his or her hand at the convention is tion at all existed. Several bills given the opportunity to discuss any subject under discussion. have now been introduced in Our Constitution guarantees the rights of individual members. Congress to return jurisdiction This was brought about by full participation in previous conto the states when the NLRB ventions. True democracy can only be continued and expanded refuses to act, which, if enacted by full attendance in conventions in the future. We therefore into law, would most likely be call on every local of the Office Employes International Union a serious blow against unions.

> "If our legal victory forces or helps persuade the NLRB to accept its responsibility by taking jurisdiction over everything that affects commerce, we ought

to have a good chance to forestall any action in Congress," said Mr. Finley. "In that way, we can keep protection of the national law and not be faced these legal attacks have to be courts have previously given it. with the prospect of having made." state courts enjoin lawful union activities. If the Board does not change its standards, we believe that new legal attacks are now in order on the NLRB rules. We hope that the Supreme Court decision in our the unlimited power on juris- jurisdiction in industries that OEIU victory will be useful if diction that practically all substantially affect commerce.



Joseph Finley, General Counsel for the OEIU (right), on the steps of the U. S. Supreme Court with OEIU Secretary-Treasurer Howard Hicks. In background is the Capitol dome.

victory may be important to the that the Board had declined juentire labor movement, Mr. risdiction in purely local fields, Finley added, for two specific leaving the implication that reasons. First, it demonstrated there may be serious doubt that the NLRB does not have whether the Board can decline

And second, the Supreme Court The OEIU Supreme Court repeatedly referred to the fact

### **75 Percent of US Workers Earn Below Today's Accepted Wage Standards**

By ALEXANDER UHL

San Francisco (PAI) - The publications of the National As- the vast majority earn far from drum beat of charges that Ameri- sociation of Manufacturers or the what might be called "commonly can workers, largely sparked by U. S. Chamber of Commerce or accepted" standards of living. organized labor, are getting too the Farm Bureau Federation that big a share of the economic pie do not blame high wages for inand so are responsible for tocreases in the cost of living. day's inflation is far from dying Yet analysis of the basic needs of American workers and their down.

Indeed, from the viewpoint of

is particularly important because the Bureau of Labor Statistics has indicated that the purchasing power of American workers has declined in the same period ending March 15, 1957. This happens to be the first time in two and a half years that the factory workers' buying power showed no gain over the

These figures would definitely indicate that workers' wages do not have the inflationary effect that certain public officials would lead one to think. Last year, for example, a major industry increased its prices almost three times the sum of the wage increases given to its workers.

While the cost of living continues to increase, it will be necessary for workers everywhere to insist on compensatory increases.

### **Investigation Results**

Recently a Senate Committee conducted extended investigations into the affairs of certain unions. These investigations have resulted in exposures which tend to embarrass the entire labor movement.

Under no circumstances does the Office Employes International Union condone the actions of certain labor officials. However, we are much concerned with the effects of these investigations insofar as reform recommendations are concerned. Ninetyeight per cent of the labor unions in the United States and Canada are good, clean organizations doing an excellent job on behalf of their respective memberships in the face of adverse conditions.

I am certain that these unions will agree with the OEIU when we say that every safeguard should be adopted to insure the mined to do the same thing in this instance. true democratic functioning of labor unions. Most of these International Union constitutions.

Democratic elections, regular financial reports audited by independent certified public accountants should be the order of the day as it is in the OEIU.

In reading the newspapers recently, we note the tendency of representative of honest trade unionism.

There are few issues of the actual annual earnings shows that

politicians to take the opportunity of the present investigations to call for a nation-wide ban against the union shop. It is difficult for us to understand how the union shop has anything whatsoever to do with the possibility of corruption in labor unions. Many features of the Taft-Hartley Act which obstruct collective bargaining were incorporated in this law under the guise of protection for the working men and women of the United States. We are fearful that certain anti-labor politicians are deter-

It will be important for our local unions to alert themselves organizations have already effectuated such safeguards in their to legislation which may be introduced to impair, obstruct and possibly destroy collective bargaining which, after all, is the main purpose of a labor union.

> On the other hand, we should get behind any movement which will make our unions more democratic, cleaner and more

labor economists, the average American worker, far from getting "too much," actually is by no means getting enough to support the kind of living standard that we like to believe most Americans have. In fact, statistics show that 75 per cent are not.

#### **Recent Proof**

Latest proof of this is a report of the highly respected Heller Committee at the University of California which shows that a family of four, consisting of father, mother, and two children 8 and 13, and which rents its home, needs an income of \$5,592.59 a a year or about \$107 a week to provide for the "commonly accepted" standard of living.

### CONVENTION CALL

### OFFICE EMPLOYES INTERNATIONAL UNION

American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations and Canadian Labour Congress

707 Continental Building, Washington 5, D. C.

\*------\*--\*-----\*-----\*\*···-

### **Minneapolis Convention Call**

March 15,1957

#### GREETINGS:

You are hereby notified that, as provided by the Constitution of the Office Employes . International Union, the 1957 Convention of our International Union will be held at the Hotel Learnington, Minneapolis, Minn., beginning at 10 o'clock, Monday morning, June 10, 1957, and will continue in session from day to day until the business of the Convention shall have been completed. It is anticipated that the business of the Convention will have been concluded by late afternoon, Friday, June 14, 1957.

**REPRESENTATION:** With respect to representation, Article VI of the International Union Constitution provides as follows:

"Section 1. Each local union in good standing shall have one (1) vote in convention for each one hundred (100) members or major fraction thereof, on which per capita tax has been paid for the twelve (12) month period ending the March 31 preceding a regular convention,  $\ldots$  except that any local union having less than a major fraction of one hundred (100) shall, nevertheless, be entitled to one (1) vote.

"Section 2. No local union which has been chartered during the two (2) calendar months preceding the month of any regular . . . convention, or during the month of such convention, shall be entitled to representation at such convention.

"Section 3. Each local union shall be entitled to as many delegates as it has votes, except that no local union shall have more than five (5) delegates present at a convention. The delegate or delegates from each local union may cast the entire vote of the local union.

"Section 5. No local union may be represented at any convention of the International Union by proxy, nor may it delegate its voting strength to any other local union, and no delegate to any convention shall represent more than one (1) local union.

"Section 6. Each delegate to a convention must have been in continuous good standing with the local union he represents for at least twelve (12) months prior to the convening of the convention, unless the local union has been functioning (the period when a local union shall be deemed to be 'functioning' shall be that commencing with the first month for which per capita tax payments are regularly made) for less than one (1) year, in which case such delegate must have been in good standing during the period that the local union has been so functioning. Each delegate shall be selected by vote of the local union."

**CREDENTIALS:** Credentials in duplicate are herewith forwarded to all local unions in accordance with the number of delegates to which they would be entitled under the Constitution of our International Union, based on per capita tax payments received to date. All local unions sending delegates shall fill out such credentials and place the seal of the local union thereon. Make sure that each delegate's full address is written on the back of both the original and duplicate of his credential form. The original of each completed credential should be returned to the Secretary-Treasurer of the International Union at least four (4) weeks prior to the opening of the Convention. The duplicate should be given to the delegate and presented by him to the Secretary-Treasurer of the International Union upon his arrival at the Convention. Delegates whose credentials are not received within the time limit prescribed may be seated by action of the delegates seated at the Convention.

**RESOLUTIONS—TIME LIMIT: All resolutions, petitions, memorials or appeals to be considered by the Convention, shall be written and submitted in duplicate signed copies to the Secretary-Treasurer of the International Union and received by him not later than twenty-one (21) days prior to the opening date of the Convention.** Resolutions can be submitted only by local unions, Convention committees, and Convention delegates. Resolutions originating with the Convention's committees must have relevance to the committee's functions and can be submitted at any time prior to the submission of such committee's final report. Resolutions originating with individual delegates can be submitted at any time during the Convention with the consent of the Convention by a two-thirds (3/3) vote.

CONVENTION FUND: Local unions sending delegates to the approaching Convention

the International Union Secretary-Treasurer shall issue to the local union a check drawn on this Fund in the amount determined by Section 4 of this article, and subject to conditions in Section 7 hereof.

"Section 7. Local unions which are not represented at such convention or whose representation at such a convention is limited to officers and/or representatives of the International Union and whose expenses to such convention are paid for by the International Union, shall not share in this Fund for such convention, and any such local unions which may have been paid from this Fund for such convention shall refund to the International Union for redeposit in this Fund any such payments."

Local unions sending at least one delegate to the Convention, other than an officer and/or representative of the International Union and whose expenses to the Convention will be paid by the International Union, will receive the following amounts from this Fund:

No.	Amt.	No.	Amt.	No.	Amt.	No.	Amt.	No.	Amt.
1.	\$84.32	57	\$157.91	130	\$76.89	209	.\$170.28	284	\$166.65
2.	154.11		162.69	131	113.85	212	. 120.62	286 .	. 167.48
	261.36	59	39.27	134	230.84	214		288 .	. 159.39
	115.50	60	173.42	135	158.73	215		290 .	. 110.88
	185.30	61	99.83	137	139.92	216	. 52.80	291 .	. 130.02
	74.58		190.08	139	252.78	219	. 52.47	293	. 34.65
	230.18		184.31	140	251.46	220			. 165.00
	49.34		120.45	141	167.97	221	. 51.48		. 207.90
	89.60		171.93	142	166.82	225			. 239.42
	235.46		124.58	144	130.68	228			. 172.10
		68	235.46	147	113.36	230			. 239.25
	76.89		246.35	151	107.25	231		301	. 154.94
	162.53		169.13	153	167.97	232			. 131.67
	236.78		196.52	154	114.68	233			. 251.46
	1.32		16.83	155	94.05	236			. 133.98
	103.95		107.25	157	150.32	237			. 131.67
	142.23		184.31	158	54.45	241		308	
	89.10		46.20	159	166.32	243		309	
	166.65		118.64	161	103.95	246			. 184.80
	149.66		45.38	165	149.82	247			. 62.37
	231.33		181.50	166	98.67	251			. 130.02
-	162.03		50.33 243.87	167	63.53 169.62	254			. 213.84
	184.31		160.38		98.34	255		320	
	178.86		167.81	172	106.43	257		321	
	. 58.58		35.48	. 174	251.46				
	. 260.04		164.51	177	101.48				and the second second
	. 251.46		170.28	179	132.66	260			. 165.83
	162.86		165.83	180	147.68	263		329	
	. 166.65		28.88	182	115.01	264		330	
	. 122.60		162.86	184	122.93	265		331	
	. 130.02		206.58	185	88.44	267		332	
	38.78		161.70	186	122.27	268		333	
	38.61	105	116.82	187	192.39	269		334	
42 .	89.60	106	180.68	191	179.03	270		335	
	16.50	110	142.23	192	196.68	272	. 174.08	336	. 38.98
	142.23	112	164.18	196	187.61	273	. 98.34	337	. 152.46
	217.31	114	213.18	199	143.22	274	. 117.98	338	. 38.57
	70.46		132.66	200	36.63	275		339 .	
	103.95		183.15	201	157.08	277		342	
	126.06		172.59	202	154.77	278		343	
	47.85		137.28	204	157.30	279		344	
	149.16		14.36	205	167.97	281		348 .	
	89.10		249.32	207	218.63	282			. 11.85
56 ;	211.20	129	174.24	208	250.80	283	. 165.83	378 .	. 236.78

HOTEL RESERVATIONS: Headquarters for the Convention and for the officers and Executive Board members of our International Union will be at the Hotel Learnington.

Hotel reservation requests should be sent to the Hotel Learnington, Minneapolis 4, Minn. For the convenience of delegates we are furnishing reservation cards so that they may promptly request the type of reservation they desire. Hotel reservations should be made as promptly as possible and if reservations are requested by letter, it should be pointed out that these are being made for delegates attending the Convention.

Room rates at the Hotel Learnington are presently as follows:

will be assisted in meeting a portion of the expense through the International Union's Convention Fund. Article VII of the International Union Constitution provides in part as follows with respect to the Convention Fund:

"Section 2. Each local union eligible to participate in a regular convention by sending at least one (1) delegate to such convention shall be paid a portion of the total amount in this Fund, based on monthly payments received from local unions through the month of February of the regular convention year, and including any balance in such Fund, subject to the following provisions:

"Section 3. In determining the amount to be paid each eligible local union participating in such regular convention, the total amount in the Fund as defined in Section 2 of this article shall be divided by the total of all the straight map miles between each and every eligible local union's charter city and the convention city.

"Section 4. Each eligible local union participating in such regular convention shall be paid an amount equal to the result of the division defined in Section 3 of this article (figured to the next lower half cent) multiplied by the number of straight map miles such local union is from the city in which such convention is being held. Any local union contributing to the Convention Fund less than one (1) year prior to February of the convention year shall participate in the Fund at the rate of one-twelfth of a normal share for each month of participation.

"Section 5. Included in each regular Convention Call of the International Union . . . sent to each local union shall be a statement indicating the amount which will be paid from this Fund to local unions participating in such convention in accordance with Section 4 of this article.

"Section 6. Upon receipt of a properly executed delegate's convention credential, bearing the seal of the local union and signatures of its president and secretary-treasurer,

 Single Room
 \$8.00
 \$8.50
 \$9.00
 \$9.50

 Double Room, Double Bed.
 10.00
 10.50
 11.00
 11.50

 Double Room, Twin Beds.
 11.00
 12.50
 13.00
 \$14.00
 \$15.00
 \$16.00

 Suites.
 \$15 and \$25 for Single.
 \$18 and \$30 for Double.
 (All rooms with bath. For air-conditioned rooms, add \$1.50 to above rates.)

Fraternally yours,

J. HOWARD HICKS, Secretary-Treasurer. HowARD COUGHLIN, President.

#### Vice Presidents.

Edward Beaupre, J. O. Bloodworth, John T. Finnerty, George P. Firth, Arthur J. Fritz, Nicholas Juliano, John B. Kinnick, Max J. Krug, Joseph P. McCusker, Marie Mann, A. H. O'Brien, Edward P. Springman,

Local union secretary-treasurers will please read this call at the first meeting of their local union.

from the desk of the PRESIDE

ARD COUGH

# **ILO Report**

HAVE recently returned from Geneva, Switzerland, where I was in attendance as a Workers' Delegate at a meeting called by the International Labor Organization of the Advisory Committee on Salaried Employes and Professional Workers.

Both the names of Russell Stephens, president of the American Federation of Technical Engineers, AFL-CIO, and your President were submitted by President George Meany to the United States Department of Labor as delegates to this meeting. We were subsequently appointed by James Mitchell, U. S. Secretary of Labor.

The meeting originally scheduled to be held in October 1956 was postponed three times and was finally held in Geneva beginning April 1 and concluding April 13, 1957.

These meetings are tripartite in nature and consist of representatives of industry, labor and government. In this instance, the Advisory Committee on Salaried Employes and Professional Workers was selected from the following countries: United States, Germany, Finland, France, Italy, Greece, India, Great Britain, Sweden, Switzerland, Uruguay, Austria, Mexico, Norway, Holland, Peru, Ceylon, Denmark, Belgium, Egypt and Brazil.

The meetings were held at the Palace of Nations. For purposes of explanation, it would be desirable to explain that the International Labor Organization was set up by the League of Nations after World War I for purposes of taking human labor out of competition in world markets. It was intended that the wages and working conditions throughout the world would be brought into a proper balance so that competition between nations for world trade would depend on factors other than human labor.

An advisory committee, such as the one of which I was a member, makes recommendations to the governing body of the I. L. O. Thereafter the governing body of the I. L. O., if it approves of such recommendations, submits them to the nations of the world affiliated with it for purposes of having these nations implement these recommendations with legislation. While this procedure is voluntary, those nations which failed to adopt the recommendations are called upon to explain why they failed to do so. Thereafter much pressure is put in those instant cases to have those nations adopt the recommendations of the I.L.O.

Down through the years, since its formation in 1919, the I. L. O. has been able to steadily decrease the work week and improve the wages, hours and working conditions of workers throughout the world. Our meeting was particularly significant because it marked the first time in the history of the I. L. O. that a committee was asked to take up the question of collective bargaining for non-manual or white-collar workers.

The United States delegation was represented by Mr. Joseph Bertotti of the General Electric Company, Mr. W. Jones of the Atlantic Refining Company, George Tobias, attached to the State Department in Geneva, Mr. Clarence Lundquist of the

### "In Our Country We Do It This Way"



President Coughlin of the OEIU exchanges views at the Geneva session with Erling Dinesen, president of the Danish Union of Commercial and Clerical Employes.

as we know them here in the United States, to organize was tion insofar as a fair reward for specifically laid down and agreed to as a doctrine. This may not mean too much in this country, but it is very important in other countries where such a right has never been recognized. This right to organize not only involves employes in private enterprise but also has been extended to public workers.

Collective bargaining has been agreed to as the normal method of fixing the conditions of employment of salaried employes and professional workers. It has been agreed by the Advisory Committee that this right to negotiate and conclude collective bargaining agreement should be accorded without discrimination to organizations which properly represent nonmanual workers. It has also been agreed that collective bargaining agreements for non-manual workers should deal with, among other things, matters of remuneration, questions of conditions of employment and any other matters of procedure which affect the relations between the employer and the employes. It has also been agreed that a collective bargaining agreement should provide for a duration, a period of termination and a process for the revision or renewal of such agreement.

The committee called upon the governments of the world to provide voluntary conciliation machinery, appropriate to national conditions. This conciliation machinery should be authorized by national legislation and the agreements should also contain provisions to assist in the prevention and settlement of disputes between union and employers of salaried and professional employes. The committee also stated that the parties should give serious consideration to the possibility of submitting disputes to the voluntary arbitration where conciliation machinery proves inadequate.

The resolution adopted on working conditions of technical and supervisory staffs in industry brings to light the attitude of other governments relative to these workers. In too many instances, lower echelon supervisory staffs in the United States are excluded from collective bargaining agreements. This is generally not true in European countries.

The session went on record in recommendations calling for systems of education and training to deal with the shortage of technical employes and supervisory staffs. The committee stated that attention should be given to insuring reasonable job security and proper conditions of employment for technical and supervisory staffs. Proper status and remuneration should be guaranteed. Provision against unemployment and industry accidents in addition to inclusion of retirement plans should be accorded to these workers. The Committee also proposed that engineers or salaried inventors be given the fullest protec-

the inventive effort is concerned. There were a number of other resolutions dealing with the problems of teachers and other specific categories of white-collar employment passed by the Com-

mittee. All in all, however, the Committee has recommended to the I. L. O. many of the conditions of employment which are already prevalent in the United States for non-manual workers.

While a number of the trade union representatives participating in this meeting were inclined to ask the government to legislate remuneration and conditions of employment due to the practices which are prevalent in their



country, the Committee did not so recommend. As a majority, the Committee felt as we did, that free collective bargaining will be of the greatest benefit in the long run.

Both President Stephens and I gained a greater knowledge of world conditions pertaining to white-collar employment and extended our scope insofar as trade unionism is concerned internationally.

United States Labor Department in Washington, D. C., Russell Stephens and myself.

The work of the committee consisted of a study of action taken on past reports of this committee and proposals for collective bargaining relating to non-manual workers and working conditions of technical and supervisory staffs in industry.

Russell Stephens was appointed to serve on the subcommittee relative to the working conditions of technical and supervisory staffs in industry and I was selected to work on the subcommittee on non-manual workers and collective bargaining. These subcommittees are also tripartite and the employers worked as a unit for purposes of minimizing the recommendations. However, after two weeks of subcommittee meetings, full committee meetings and plenary sessions, a number of very important recommendations were agreed to. Some of these were agreed to over the objections of the employers. In a number of instances the government representatives voted with the employers but in most instances, they voted with the workers and groups. In most cases, however, we were able to obtain unanimous agreement.

The right of non-manual workers, or white-collar workers

### **ILO Delegates at Geneva Session**



The Advisory Committee on Salaried Employes and Professional Workers of the ILO in session at Geneva. In this photo, the management delegates are on the left, the government delegates in the center, and the labor delegates on the right. One observer pointed out that there were no political implications in this seating arrangement. Had the photo been made from the other end of the hall, the labor delegates would have appeared "on the left."