FILE NAME: Asten Hill (AH)

DATE: 1960 June 9

DOC#: AH030

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Meeting Minutes

MEETING WITH THE UNION -- JUNE 9, 1960

Representing Management: D. V. Asten, D. R. Holmes & R. A. Marshall

Representing A.H.T.W.I.O.: Entire Executive Committee plus the Chief Stewards

R. Whittaker first asked that if the negotiations are not settled by June 15th will any settlement made after that date be made retroactive to June 15th. The answer was yes. He went on to say that the Committee as a whole feel that our offer of 5¢ an hour is out of the question. He feels that the employees are not getting their just share of the profits. Also the Committee feels that they could not even take this back to the body for consideration. R. Whittaker actually read a prepared statement, and D.V.A. asked if we would be given a copy. Some parts of the statement were clarified, but no copy was offered.

The Committee was asked if they had considered settling for a shorter period of time; they said yes, but feel that they would have to get permission from the body. D.V.A. asked just what authority the Committee had to negotiate, and whether or not agreement by them would insure acceptance. They said they really could not agree to anything, it was up to the body. D.V.A. stressed that there has to be an understanding between the Committee and the Company as to their attitude towards any agreement.

D.R.H. brought up the possibility of an agreement for a shorter length of time than two years. E. Thoma said that it was up to us to make an offer specifying the time period and the amount offered which they could accept or reject. D. Pezzuto asked why our attitude towards a long term contract had changed. D.V.A. answered and said our attitude had not changed but felt that wages could be negotiated at shorter intervals to adjust to changing conditions. D.V.A. asked the reason for their negative attitude towards a shorter period. R.Whittaker said that the Committee was split and that they had decided to go strictly according to the Contract. D.V.A. asked if we were just wasting our time discussing a shorter period and T. Ward said that even 5¢ for one year would not be acceptable. D.V.A. pointed out that a dilemma exists, that on one hand they want to go along with the Company, and on the other hand they want more money to keep up with their neighbors.

D.R.H. made the statement that the question of dust or health conditions should not be made part of negotiations year after year. He said that while we are not trying to minimize the hazard they should not be used as a weapon every time we negotiate. E. Thoma was quite incensed and came right back with the fact that the Company always brings competitors' wages up. He feels that their health is just as important to them as the competition is to the Company.

T. Ward drew a comparison between now and twenty years ago as far as increases go. He feels that possibly some of the increases they received too easily over the years are hurting them now.

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
SF 609-L

Meeting with the Union (Cont'd) June 9, 1960

D.V.A. stated that by offering to negotiate wages in one year, we are not abandoning the five year Contract, but trying to get an up to date picture each year.

There was a recess at this time.

D.V.A. disclosed that in error we had omitted to pay them a 1¢ Cost of Living increase which was due them on February 15th. He said we were sorry but we would pay it retroactively to February 15th. D. Pezzuto seemed quite surprised that he had missed it. There will be another 1¢ due on June 15th.

D.V.A. reviewed the situation from the viewpoint of the Board of Directors and the attractive offers that are being made to relocate our operations, and how they would view any widening of the gap between the competitors' wages and our own. It was also pointed out that a new twister was coming in and a new calender had been ordered. If we are to exist new machinery must be brought in, however it will increase our cost of manufacturing. A picture was presented showing the Salem plant from the air. It was pointed out that only one bay is being use, with two others that could be used to manufacture asbestos dryer felts.

D.V.A. pointed out that under the savings plan offered, if the Company paid 5¢ into this plan it would be worth 6¢ to the employees because of the tax savings. R. Whittaker stated that these facts were not pertinent because they wanted to negotiate for money; how they would apply this money would be decided afterwards.

D.V.A. then reaffirmed our offer outlining it as follows: savings plan worth 6¢, Cost of Living 2¢, medical plan 1¢ making a total of 9¢ an hour. They will have another Committee meeting to discuss our offer.

R. Whittaker asked if we would pay for Committee meetings off the premises. We said we were not liable to pay for meetings held off the premises and we would not pay for them.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

R. A. M.

RAM:fk