Gains Won at Enclild, Ohio
The largest strike in the history of the Addressograph-Multigraph Corp. the members of Local 49, Euclid, Ohio, were victorious in winning new economic gains. The strike started on June 12, 1959 when the production workers who are members of the International Association of Machinists walked out. Local 49 members respected the IAM lines until June 22, 1959 at which time they also went on strike. At the time Local 49 notified the Company they were also on strike, the Company had made no offer to the OEIU group which numbers 760 strong. In the long negotiating sessions that followed, Local 49 was able to win a package which included four dollars across the board retroactive to June 1, 1959.

New Pension Plan
Also a new pension plan was negotiated with several increases in benefits which also included those already retired. Other gains included time and one half after eight hours in any one day (the Local had been trying to get this for five years), also making the funeral leave closer to more liberal by adding additional relatives, and other points, some of which were the direct result of the strike.

The Negotiating Committee was composed of Norman Hays Chief Steward, James Richards Vice President, and members Charles Veliu, Ralph Puro and Earl Sebring.

The Committee was assisted during these negotiations by OEIU International Representative J. M. Bleth.

The officers and members of Local 49 have requested the International to thank all local union officials who gave financial assistance.

Company Offer Accepted by Local 212
A threatened strike at Remington Rand Inc., Buffalo, N. Y., was averted as clerical workers, represented by Local 212, accepted company proposals, made under a wage re-opener, to advance pay raises due next January under a four-year contract.

The union, after taking a strike vote, continued negotiations with the company in mediation that resulted in a new revision which was made in the company offer. About 130 lowest paid employees will be reclassified and will receive weekly pay raises ranging from $2 to $4 in addition to the $2 to $4 increases effective immediately for all 700 clerical workers in the bargaining unit.

The general increases, which would have been due January, went into effect July 20. Third year increases in the same amount are due next June 18 and the contract expires in October 1961, rather than in January 1962, as originally provided.

Local 251 Signs With Sandia
OEIU Local 251 and the Metal Trades Council bargained jointly with the Sandia Corporation in Albuquerque, N. Mex., which runs an atomic energy plant, and recently renewed the agreement.

Including this new increase, the rate ranges now have starting salaries up to $5.25 per week and standard rates up to $14.34 per week.

Along with the other terms of the agreement which were improved, the sick leave provision was broadened and the terms of maternity leave were improved.

One unusual article in the new agreement states that all employees will be kept well informed of their radiation exposure and upon termination will be given a record of their total radiation exposure.

International Paper Signs With OEIU Locals
A contract settlement between OEIU Locals 71, 80, 209 and 233 was reached with the International Paper Company, Southern Kraft Division.

A 3 per cent general wage increase with a minimum of 76c an hour effective August 1, 1959, is contained in the new agreement.

On June 1, 1960, an additional general increase of 4 per cent will be effectuated.

Three weeks vacation after ten years of service and an additional holiday were also obtained.

The company has also agreed to contribute $2 each month to the monthly cost of each employee’s life insurance policy, to a maximum of $1,000.

The Arizona Chemical Company, which is jointly controlled by the International Paper Company and the American Cyanamid Company, also signed the same contract with OEIU Local 80.

Vice President Bloodworth addressed the committees in these negotiations.

Logue Appointed United Fund Chairman
Jim Logue, president of OEIU Local 51 in Mobile, has been appointed chairman of the United Fund’s forthcoming drive in that city.

Brother Logue’s work will center around promotions and publicity.

Logue is well known in Mobile for his work as a labor leader and union organizer.

SOUTHERN KRAFT COMMITTEES—Shown is the committee representing OEIU locals party to contract with the International Paper Company, Southern Kraft Division. Left to right: L. E. Combest, Local 209, Kreole, Miss.; J. T. Martin, Local 253, Georgetown, S. C.; J. D. Bloodworths, OEIU Vice President; Wm. E. Cole, Jr., and Guy Pixler, Local 80 Panama City, Fla. Left to right, second row: Nick Brown, Local 71, Mobile, Ala.; Artie Pigg, Local 209, Kreole, Miss.; Jack Bourne, Local 253, Georgetown, S. C.; Herbert Dyecon, Local 209, Kreole, Miss.; Dewey Harder, Local 71, Mobile, Ala.; Travis Wiltman, Local 80, Panama City, Fla., and Clayton Lowe, Local 71, Mobile, Ala.

Ratifying Contract at Euclid, Ohio
(Story in Column 1)

Signing with Sandia Corp. at Albuquerque
(Story in Column 2)

Improvements Gained in International Paper Contract
(Story in Column 3)

Left to right: Ralph Pen, Charles Veliu and Earl Sebring, of negotiating committee; J. M. Bleth, International Representative, OEIU; Norman Hays, chief steward; Tony Ueh, (not speaking) president, Local 493, James Richards, (building local) vice president, Local 49 negotiating committee; Beverly Sebring, recording secretary; John Dugan, secretary-treasurer.

* (*)
U.S. Rubber Agreement Inked

Stock Named to Buffalo Central Body
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New Gas Company Agreement Signed

A new two-year agreement was signed by the representatives of Local 5, Washington, D. C., and the Washington Gas Light Company, covering 569 employee officers of that company. The settlement provided for a 5.5 per cent wage increase and improvements in the pension plan. This represents a 25 per cent increase in the average salary. The changes in the pension plan provide revisions of the methods of computing benefits and, in the case of the Washington employed, an increase in the amount of retirement benefits paid by the company of from 31 per cent to 52 per cent. The changes will likewise provide future retirees 48 per cent of their last average compensation. This is based on length of service and the average earnings of the ten calendar days preceding the month of retirement. The agreement is effective as of July 1, 1959.

Bud Manning announces a recent arbitration victory of the employes in their demand for a minimum wage of $5 per day to $518 per week, by the company paying the full cost of the increase. Shown in the agreement are: control, by the company, of 38 per cent of the company's profits, thereby determined by dividing the total amount thereof, by the number of weeks elapsed between the date of discharge and the date of offer of services as offered. Such installments shall be added to the wages of the employee by the terms of the contract to which he was granted his employment. Manning is particularly proud of this victory because of the fact that it was opposed by the face of expensive legal counsel belonging to the Knights of Columbus. They expressed their representations to the President Consultant and Director of Organization Duties for permitting Organizing Manning to help in with so much of his time to this case despite the criticism. Manning was one of the most prominent members of the local unions involved in the arbitration.

The convention urged all local unions to seek for the rights of the employes of this company. Manning is a member of the local unions involved.

The convention urged all local unions to seek for the rights of the employes of this company. Manning is a member of the local unions involved.

5th Convention in Retrospect

The attention of all OEU local unions is called to the following actions taken at the eighth convention of the Office Employees International Union at Montreal.

The convention urged all local unions to seek for the rights of the employes of this company. Manning is a member of the local unions involved.

New Convention in Retrospect

The attention of all OEU local unions is called to the following actions taken at the eighth convention of the Office Employees International Union at Montreal.

The convention urged all local unions to seek for the rights of the employes of this company. Manning is a member of the local unions involved.
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The convention urged all local unions to seek for the rights of the employes of this company. Manning is a member of the local unions involved.
Reversed on Benefits from Union Drive

The National Labor Relations Board disagrees with a trial examiner's conclusion that a small group of white collar employees at the American Freightways Co. did not engage in concerted activities.

Examiner Sydney S. Asher, Jr., concluded after examining each employee's personnel record and interviews with the Local 153 that none of the changes instituted by the company or in connection with the unions' organizing campaign were violative of the Act. His reasoning was that gains of economic benefits "are not per se violations" and that the element of discriminator
ty intent—which would have made them violations—was not shown.

A Board majority disagrees with the examiner on a number of specific charges. The Board says "the advance payment had failed to prove it had not been done before and where such posting makes holidays certain that would otherwise be uncertain until the day before the holiday, conceals the function of the regulations in the terms of employees' rights."

In another charge, the examiner had found that the wage policy in overtime work was not an economic benefit, the Board says "the advance payment had failed to prove it had not been done before and where such posting makes holidays certain that would otherwise be uncertain until the day before the holiday, conceals the function of the regulations in the terms of employees' rights."

According to the majority opinion, the company's policy was not an "economic benefit," because it was not an "economic incentive" which would otherwise be uncertain until the day before the holiday, concealing the function of the regulations in the terms of employees' rights.

The majority opinion states: "It is well established that the test of interference, constraint and coercion under Section 8(b)(1) of the Act does not turn on the economic benefit element. Rather, the question is whether the coercion succeeded or failed. The company policy was not an economic benefit, as defined by the Board, but it is economic in the sense that it contributed to the company's competitive position in the market. The Board, however, rejected the argument that the company policy was not an economic benefit because it was not an "economic incentive.""
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