



VOL. 1, No. 1

DECEMBER, 1963

FACT SHEET

JOHN A. CONDON
Public Relations

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S ASSOCIATION, AFL-CIO
265 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. 10011 • WAtkins 4-3111

LEGISLATION

Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor

This unconstitutional agency that is continually trying to destroy our union has been condemned in recent weeks by many important segments of organized labor.

A resolution adopted by our 40th International Convention last July (to terminate the existence of the Waterfront Commission or at the very least amend the Waterfront Commission Compact to close the Longshoremen's Register and return the process of hiring longshoremen to the joint control of labor and management) was endorsed by the New York State AFL-CIO Convention and the AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department Convention. The National AFL-CIO Convention voted to have the AFL-CIO Executive Board meet with the ILA, on February 17 of next year to take appropriate action.

While members in ports other than New York may feel this is only a local problem concerning the membership in the New York - New Jersey area, nothing could be further than the truth. This union-busting agency has broad powers and is continually interfering with the machinery of your International Union and indirectly has jurisdiction over every local and ILA member in the country.

Air Pollution Bill Passed by Senate

Joseph Leonard, Safety Director of the ILA, hailed Senate passage of the omnibus air pollution bill (H.R. 6518) introduced by Senator Case of New Jersey. Brother Leonard stated that a section of the bill requiring the Federal Government to compile and publish criteria on the harmful effects of air pollution agents would be of great assistance to the ILA Safety Committee in its efforts to enforce employers to keep the air clean and healthful while our

members are working. Under this new bill, the criteria of air quality, published by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, would be revised and expanded whenever necessary to reflect accurately developing scientific knowledge, through a program of continuing research. When the air sampling tabulations are published now, the layman can make little sense out of them.

Right-to-Work Issue in 1964

We now have right-to-work laws on the books in 20 states. Legislation is being actively pushed in the 30 remaining states by the Right-to-Work Committee. This committee is supported by 15,000 members and has a budget of about \$450,000 a year. The committee, whose only function is to destroy labor unions, have passed four right-to-work laws since it began operations in 1955: Utah, Indiana, Kansas and Wyoming, the latter this May.

The other right-to-work states are: *Arkansas, Florida, Arizona, Nebraska, Georgia, Iowa, North Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, North Dakota, Nevada, Alabama, South Carolina and Mississippi.*

The ILA has locals in the above states that are italicized.

Fred Field, International General Organizer, has been appointed Chairman of the ILA Political Action Committee by President Gleason, and is in the process of forming an active Anti-Right-to-Work Committee, consisting of officials of locals in these states. Brother Field points out that a number of states have repealed such laws in recent years due to united action by organized labor — New Hampshire, Maine, Delaware, Louisiana, and Hawaii. The Louisiana law was only partially repealed, he said, and still applies to agricultural workers.

AUTOMATION

By: International President Gleason

One thing the shipping industry managements don't seem to have learned from all of the bitter labor disputes we have faced and resolved together, is that the dock worker has economic problems which hit him harder than any of the economic problems that befall a big business enterprise. When a business venture goes sour, management at least has some alternatives for reinvestment, or a fresh start.

When a dock worker's job disappears, what are his chances for a fresh start in some other industry? What does a dock worker's wife and kids do while he is trying to make this fresh start? You see, the dock worker is faced with a competitive problem, too. His competition is "the new technology." More and more, the changes that are taking place in industry are calling for the use of more self-regulating equipment and less human beings. And, the shipping industry is no exception. What we have called "automation" in cargo handling, covers many changes in the methods of loading, unloading, storing and carrying cargo. These changes have pointed only one way — and that is, to ever fewer work opportunities for the longshoreman.

How *should* we react when jobs are threatened? How does management react when it is confronted by an economically fatal new situation? Does it stand still and let it happen? Or, does it try to accommodate the change, while at the same time assuring the survival of the business organization?

These are tough questions because they arise out of tough problems. No worker and no union of workers can afford to stand idly by while jobs are threatened by changing methods of work. In that respect alert working people are no different than alert business executives. When disaster threatens they do something to avoid it.

This is what the union has tried to do in shipping, with only modest success, in the past four years. We could have been far more successful, if we had had genuine cooperation from management in our repeated efforts to facilitate the expansion of new technology by providing simultaneous expansion of job and income security for the dock worker.

For those of us who have been actively involved in the collective bargaining between the ILA and the shipping industry, the industry's attempt to re-write our recent labor relations history in an effort to win sympathy it is not entitled to have, is so funny that it is tragic. Tragic because it apparently means that the industry is going to make serious and basic errors in labor relations in the future, in an effort to cover over its past errors.

To hear management tell it, you would never have guessed that it was the ILA, not the industry, that attempted as far back as January 1959 to develop a basic statement of principles which would guide the union and the industry to a mutually advantageous program for technological and human advances in cargo handling. But, that is a fact, In 1959, we brought an outstanding labor economist into the joint conferences on automation, and one of the products of his work was a statement of policy which called for sharing the gains from increasing productivity among the industry, its employees, and its customers.

Within three months thereafter we presented the industry with detailed recommendations to implement our broad statement of principles on this problem. Among our recommendations was one which called for a guaranteed year's employment to the dock worker. The industry's representatives dismissed this and other new and imaginative recommendations for labor policy in the shipping industry as "visionary" and "impractical."

There used to be a time when businessmen could afford the luxury of dismissing new engineering ideas for products and equipment as "visionary." Today, no business can risk its future with careless appraisals of the potential products and services of tomorrow. What management has yet to learn is that it can no longer afford to dismiss new ideas for the establishment of new labor policies which are designed for new industrial methods. Today's visionary is tomorrow's realist. Management must learn to stop trying to operate the industries of the 1960's with the labor policies of the 1860's.

I have noticed the development of a surprising increase in shipping management's interest in government assistance in labor relations. I was delighted to find that the industry's labor relations spokesman regarded the most recent strike as "senseless, suicidal, costly and paralytic," a strike which "the personal efforts of the Secretary of Labor, himself, and finally, the personal intervention of the President of the United States, were not enough to stop . . ."

I was delighted to hear this because this last strike was not a union strike. It was an industry strike.

It was not the Union's demands that shut this industry down. It was the demands made by the industry. So, when the industry characterizes the impact of this shutdown in these harsh terms, we have a confession of inexcusable senselessness and recklessness on the part of management.

I did not want a strike in these most recent negotiations. Nor did the men want a strike. And, we told the industry negotiators so. But the industry's negotiators mistook the symptoms of maturity in collective bargaining for the symptoms of weakness.

Those of you who followed those negotiations closely know that I publicly charged that the industry had made a deal at a high level of government in Washington. They had hoped to use the power of government to put that deal across. History cannot be re-written on this point. That deal was made, but the dock workers refused to become the victims of it. The settlement that was finally worked out by a special Presidential mediation team headed by Senator Wayne Morse, was not what we wanted, but we accepted it because it was free of the taint of the raw deal the industry had worked out in Washington. To the everlasting credit of Senator Morse, Theodore W. Kheel, and James Healy, they called their shots as they saw them.

Part of the Alice-in-Wonderland bedtime story concocted for the gullible by the shipping industry negotiators came complete with a set of phony statistics, which are still being recited to mislead the uninformed. We were told that the industry was plagued by "featherbedding" and declining productivity. From observation I have learned that when a negotiator's imagination gives out during collective bargaining, he resorts to name-calling. And, the best names to use are those that are currently the most unpopular. By this simple tactic, the propagandist turns the dock worker into a "featherbedder."

It was interesting to hear this "featherbedding" charge used in the industry's publicity releases during the negotiations, because at no time during the three years of that expiring contract, nor in the three-year contract before that, was any such claim made by the industry in any labor-management committee, sub-committee, or conference group. No such claim was ever made before our joint labor-management automation committee, which functioned for almost a year, and held meetings at which both sides let their hair down about the problems that bothered them most. When we called for examples to substantiate the charge, we found that the industry was really eager to ease up on its safety requirements, and equally ready and eager to forget the reasons and the background of specific work rules. These rules had been hammered out in negotiations over a period of many years. We had yielded benefits, wages, and other conditions as part of the horse-trading for safe work-load and safe working environment. All of this was conveniently forgotten by management in its eagerness to undermine the union's position.

Is it any wonder that the shipping industry's representatives speak prayerfully of more government control of labor relations, and longingly of the kinds of ship blockades that "you can at least shoot your way out of . . ."? Some people with great responsibilities in difficult situations would rather be shoot-em-up generals than talk-it-out statesmen. In a free country the way of the statesman is harder, but more in keeping with our national ideals.

I mentioned some phony statistics used by industry on productivity in cargo handling. When I heard them from industry, I knew they were phony even before I turned them over for study to our research office. You can show either a rise or a decline in New York port productivity in cargo handling — take your choice — depending on the base period you pick for comparing the present level of efficiency. If you take a ten-year period, you're back to the Korean war and the special reasons for a spurt in productivity that go with war-time volume and war-time cargo mix. This gives you a high base, and everything thereafter looks lower, by comparison. If you go back twenty-five years, or fifteen years, you get a low base, and then everything thereafter looks higher, by comparison. This kind of hocus pocus with figures was only the least of the industry's failures in our recent contract negotiations.

In spite of this dismal record of management conduct in collective bargaining, I still have hopes of a better day in the industry's labor relations. I don't intend to shower the industry with pious and high-sounding platitudes about the need for cooperation between labor and management. There are other needs that are more important for the successful handling of our problems. We need courage and we need imagination.

The union is watchfully awaiting the outcome of the manpower utilization study being conducted by the U. S. Department of Labor. After some initial stumbling on methods and the meaning of the settlement on this issue, they got under way. The shipping industry seems to have embraced this study program with enthusiasm. The ILA is somewhat more restrained. We are giving the Secretary of Labor's staff our fullest cooperation, but time has taught us to write no blank check for any group of men. They can have all the facts they want. We will express a view of their efforts, after the results are in.

I said before that "we need courage and imagination." These ingredients are inseparable. I would like us to use them in this industry to produce labor policies which are independent of a reliance upon government. Government has a place in solving the problems of our economy, but I, for one, don't believe that its place in collective bargaining is at the steering wheel. And, I don't believe its place is that of a dimly seen backseat driver.

Either we have free collective bargaining, or we don't. If management is looking for more government control of collective bargaining and less government control of business decision-making, they should look well before they leap into this one. These two controls go hand in hand. Like the old refrain on "Love and Marriage" — "you can't have one without the other." Wage policy, price policy,

(Continued on Page 4)

and profit policy are all of a piece. If one of these is yielded to government, all will be.

What I am hoping to accomplish during my tenure as head of the ILA is not really a miracle. It amounts to a shakeup in the thinking of management — and of some union people, too — on issues that have up to now defied solution. If we continue to tax each other for the accrued problems of the past, we may make it impossible to jointly tackle the problems of the present and the future.

We have a job of work before us. We need the will, the strength, and the boldness to do it.

SAFETY

ILA Safety Director Joseph Leonard reports that long-shore injury rates dropped 18.5 percent in the first half of this year compared with the similar period in 1962.

The only ILA ports that had an increase in their accident rates were Chicago with an increase of 53.1%, Baltimore an increase of 44.1% and Norfolk with an increase of 8.3%.

ORGANIZING

Fred Field, Jr., International Organizer, reports that the Gulfport, Mississippi Banana Terminal opened last October has now been completely organized. Organizer Field also reported that Vice-President Moran of Boston is conducting a vigorous organizing campaign in the New England area.

"It is the duty of every official of the ILA regardless of rank to help organize the unorganized" the International Organizer stated. "Every official should organize in his immediate area any of the following crafts that the ILA grants charters to: Loaders and Unloaders of All Vessels and Ships; Marine Warehouse and Dock Checkers; Marine Warehouse Freight Handlers; Grain Elevator Employees; Dock and Marine Engineers Stationary Dock Hoisters; Lighter Captains; Marine Repairmen and Firemen; Licensed Tugmen and Pilots; Tug Firemen and Linemen; Marine Divers, Helpers, Tenders and Steam Pump Operators; Dredge Engineers, Operators and Cranemen; Drill Boat Workers; Dredge Firemen and Laborers on Dredge Scows; Lumber Inspectors, Sand and Gravel Workers; Cotton and Tobacco Screwmen; General Cargo Dock Laborers; Coal Handlers and Trimmers; Coal Dock Workers; Scalemen; Weighers and Samplers; Sea Food Workers; Cargo Repairmen, Packers and Machine Hand Strappers;

Oil Handlers; Sand Ballast and Reefer Cargo Workers; Marine Carpenters; Marine Pipe Covers; Grain Ceilers; Steamship Horse and Cattle Fitters; Railroad Marine Workers; Tide Water Boatmen; Captains of Deck Scows; Ship Caulkers, Maintenance Workers; Sugar Samplers; Sugar Refinery Workers, Cotton Compress Workers; Deputy Weighmasters; Inland Waterways Freight Handlers; Crane Operators; Employees of the Federal Barge Lines; Master Divers and Submarine Workers; Pool Deck Hands and Firemen along the Great Lakes, Rivers and Seacoast in the United States, Canada, Central and South America, and the new United States possessions."

RECENT NEGOTIATIONS

Canadian ILA members won a 56-cent package after their recent 10-day strike. Settlement of the ILA dispute with the Shipping Federation of Canada was reached with the assistance of International President Gleason.

Wage gains in the ILA contract are: longshoremen, 10 cents retroactive to January 1, 1963, and 10 cents on each anniversary date, making the final rate \$2.63; checkers, 12 cents retroactive to January 1, 1963, and 11 cents on each anniversary date. Fringe benefits, valued at 26 cents, include: improved vacation pay; time-and-a-half for all Saturday work and double time for work between midnight and 5 A.M., next year.

International President Gleason called it "one of the most expensive contracts ever negotiated by any union in Canada," and added, "I was proud to represent such a group of militant union members and officials."

Edward M. Strang, chief negotiator for the Shipping Federation of Canada, said that "it was one of the most costly settlements, ever made by his group."

CUBAN BOYCOTT

Our Cuban Boycott is still in effect and has been sanctioned by government action. If any of the ships listed below arrive at any ILA port, our membership is forbidden to handle them. Any ship on the list that enters an ILA port, should be reported immediately to John Bowers, International Executive Vice-President, at International Headquarters, in New York City (Phone collect to Code 212 — WA 4-3111).

There are now 58 British flag vessels on the list, 57 of Greek registry, 39 of Lebanese and the balance are scattered among nine other countries.

The latest U. S. Maritime Administration blacklist covers the two week period ending November 15, 1963.

CUBA BLACKLIST

Achille — Italian	Chopin — Polish	London Harmony (t) — British	Polyclipper (t) — Norwegian
Aegion — Greek	Circe — French	London Independence (t) — British	Propontis — Greek
Aiolos II — Lebanese	Dagmar — Swedish	London Majesty (t) — British	Pulyxeni — Greek
Agios Therapon — Greek	Dairen — British	London Prestige (t) — British	Promina — Yugoslav
Airone — Italian	Despoina — Greek	London Pride (t) — British	Presula — Greek
Akamas — Lebanese	Dimos — Lebanese	London Spirit (t) — British	Razani — Lebanese
Akastos — Greek	Dugi Otok — Yugoslav	London Splendor (t) — British	Redbrook — British
Alaska — Lebanese	East Breeze — British	London Valour (t) — British	Redetos — Greek
Aldeoran (t) — Greek	Efcharis — Greek	London Victory (t) — British	Rio — Lebanese
Alice — Greek	Eftychia — Greek	Lovdal (t) — Norwegian	Ruthy Ann — British
Ambassade — Greek	Embassy — Greek	Lord Gladstone — British	San John — Lebanese
Americana — Greek	Enee — French	Malou — Lebanese	San Nicola (t) — Italian
Anacreon — Greek	Everest — Greek	Mantric — Lebanese	San Spyridon — Lebanese
Anatoli — Greek	Fir Hill — British	Martha Enterprise — British	Santa Lucia — Italian
Annalisa — Italian	Floram — Greek	Marie de Lourdes — Greek	Seirios — Greek
Anathas — Lebanese	Free Trader — Lebanese	Maria Santa — Greek	Stevo — Lebanese
Antonis — Lebanese	Georgos Tsarkiroglou — Lebanese	Maria Teresa — Greek	Shienfoon — British
Antonia — Greek	Galini — Greek	Marigo — Greek	Sierra Maria — Spanish
Apollon — Greek	Gloria — Greek	Maroudio — Greek	Silverforce — British
Ardgem — British	Granikos — Lebanese	Mastro Sterlos II — Greek	Silverlake — British
Areti — Lebanese	Grosvenor Mariner — British	Mauritanie — Moroccan	Stanwear — British
Ares — Lebanese	Guinee — French	Mersinidl — Lebanese	St. Anthony — Lebanese
Aristefs — Lebanese	Hazelmoor — British	Mousee — Lebanese	St. Nicolas — Lebanese
Armathia — Greek	Ho Fung — British	Nazareno — Italian	Stylios N. Vlassopoulos — Greek
Arlington Court — British	Huta Florian — Polish	Nelee — French	Sirius — Greek
Aspromonte — Italian	Hydraios III — Greek	Newgate — British	Sierra Madre — Spanish
Astir — Lebanese	Ilena — Lebanese	Newlane — British	Suva Breeze — British
Athansiosk — Greek	Iloannis Aspiotis — Lebanese	Nicolaos Frangistas — Greek	Sycamore Hill — British
Athelduke (t) — British	Inchstaffa — British	Noelle — Lebanese	Tertic — Lebanese
Athelmer (t) — British	Irena — Greek	Noemi — Lebanese	Thames Breeze — British
Atheisultan (t) — British	Istros II — Greek	North Empress — Greek	Theologos — Lebanese
Athelmonarch — British	Ivy Fair — British	North Queen — Greek	Timios Stavros — Greek
Atlantic Friend — Swedish	Kalliopi D Demos — Lebanese	Oceanracel — British	Tina — Greek
Atlas — Moroccan	Kirriemoor — British	Ocean Tramp — British	Tine — Norwegian
Avisfith — British	Kongsgaard (t) — Norwegian	Ole Bratt — Norwegian	Tulse Hill — British
Ardmore — British	Kopainia Miechowice — Polish	Overseas Explorer (t) — British	Toubkal — Moroccan
Ardrowan — British	Kopainia Siemianowice — Polish	Overseas Pioneer (t) — British	Toula — Lebanese
Atheicrown — British	Kopalnia Wujek — Polish	Olga — Lebanese	Trebisnjica — Yugoslav
Baltyk — Polish	Kostis — Greek	Pamit — Greek	Vainy — Finnish
Banora — Moroccan	Kyra Hariklia — Greek	Panagos — Lebanese	Vassiliki (t) — Greek
Bar — Yugoslav	Leftric — Lebanese	Pantanassa — Greek	Vassiliki — Lebanese
Barbarino — Greek	Linda - Giovanna (t) — Italian	Parmarina — Lebanese	Vercharmian — British
Baxtergate — British	Linkmoor — British	Paxol — Greek	Vergolivada — Lebanese
Bialystok — Polish	London Glory — British	Penelope — Greek	Vermont — British
Bytom — Polish	London Confidence (t) — British	Perseus (t) — Greek	West Breeze — British
Callippi Michalos — Greek	Polaris — Greek	Plast — Polish	Western Trader — Greek
Cannaregio — Italian	Pollux — Greek	Polaris — Greek	Yung Futary — British
Capetown Petros — Greek	Yunglutation — British	Pollux — Greek	Yunglutation — British
Castillo Amjudia — Spanish	Zela M — British		
Cavtat — Yugoslav			
Cedar Hills — British			
Chorzow — Polish			
Cornation — Lebanese			
Cetinjl — Yugoslavia			
Chipbee — British			

(t) Tanker

It has been reported that many of these ships listed above will attempt to load wheat destined for Russia. Although the I. L. A., at the request of the United States Government, agreed to handle such wheat shipments, we have never agreed to work any of the above ships under any circumstances. *Be vigilant . . . Report any of these ships that enter your port . . . By no means work them.*

To You and Your Family
 The Officers and Staff
 of
 International Office of the I.L.A.
 renew our sincere greetings
 of
 This Joyous and Holy Season



Best Wishes for
 A Merry Christmas
 and
 The Brightest and Happiest of New Years

- THOMAS W. GLEASON, *President*
- JOHN BOWERS, *Executive Vice-President*
- HARRY R. HASSELGREN, *Secretary-Treasurer*
- FRED R. FIELD, JR., *General Organizer*