FILE NAME: Owens-Corning (OC)

DATE: 1944 Nov 15

DOC#: OC395

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION: Memo

rom the Shipbuilding Commission's Directive Order. (See Cleveland trip report of eptember 12, 1944) and subsequently (October 13, 1944) we submitted a statement over F. Zimmerman's signature, which became part of the record in the American Ship case.

. At the request of Mr. J. H. Love, industrial relations manager of Federal Shipuilding and Dry Dock Co. (U. S. Steel subsidiary), Ames testified at a Shipbuilding Commission hearing in Washington on October 23, 1944, reading into the record a statement similar to that used in the American Ship case.

5. Steps have been initiated through R. O. Hazard, now director of the New Jersey Bureau of Industrial Health (Trenton), to get Drinker to issue the supplement regarding the statement on Fiberglas in "Minimum Requirements." Meanwhile we have been using photostats of Drinker's letter to Hazard of May 24, 1944, to combat that contention.

6. While the American Ship and Federal Ship cases are still pending, we have met informally with the industry members of the Shipbuilding Commission (Messrs. Paul and Soulett) requesting them to initiate an amendment to the Tentative Construction of the Gulf Coast Wage Review.

This step was taken at a luncheon at the William[illegible] in Washington on [illegible] at which, besides Messrs. Paul and Soulett, [illegible] Tracy E. Ferguson (Navy Labor Relations Officer) were present.

Messrs. Paul and Soulett agreed that the award of a premium wage on "[illegible]" fibre glass" was discriminatory.

Like Lieutenant Shields, Navy Labor Relations Officer of the Eighth [illegible] New Orleans, however, they admitted that there is no chance of a [illegible] as premium has been in effect so long and is so widespread that "[illegible] and dried thin" from a precedent angle. It is recognized that there is [illegible] health hazard involved, that there is an element of discomfort and disagreeable handling which is sufficient to justify a premium on a "dirty job" basis under conditions peculiar to the shipbuilding industry, such as working in confined spaces, lack of adequate ventilation, lack of wash-up and locker room facilities.

To our argument that Fiberglas is a form of mineral wool and that we would have no serious objection to a premium — even though it is recognized that such a premium is a subterfuge to evade wage stabilization regulations — IF the premium were applied to All forms of mineral wool and IF it were predicated, NOT upon a health hazard, but upon "dirty job conditions peculiar to the shipbuilding industry, they replied that they did not wish to be in the position of extending the premium to rock wool and slag wool, implying that they knew this would bring down upon them the wrath of J-M, and other manufacturers of rock and slag wool. Then Ames pointed out that we were under no illusions that Federal Ship or any shipyard was fighting our battle for us, and that Federal's real concern was lest they be engulfed by a tidal wave of compensation claims based on an allegation of hazard — claims that might be made to stand up under conditions surrounding the administration of the workers' compensation laws in New Jersey, where the Commission's grant of a premium wage would be misinterpreted or misconstrued as a judicial finding that the material was hazardous.

This argument struck home.

"Gentlemen," Ames said, "you are used to dealing in quid pro quos. You may not want to throw to labor something that labor hasn't asked for. But you have told us you believe this premium as it is now written into your ruling is discriminatory. You have told us it cannot be rescinded. We have been the object of unwitting discrimination on your part, probably because our material account for most of the insulation used in shipyards. But Fiberglas is a form of mineral wool — as shown by the specifications, by freight rate classification, and by trade association definitions. And what you have

said in your rulings is equivalent to telling a farmer that he has to pay a premium for harvesters when they thresh wheat, but not when they thresh rye, barley, or corn. Now, why don't you work the quid pro quo angle and use this situation to make a trade and get something else that you want from the labor representatives on the Commission?"

Then we offered the draft of a resolution (copy attached) which might be useful in amending the "Spun Glass and Fibre Glass" item in the Tentative Conclusions of the Gulf Coast Wage Review. Messrs. Paul and Howlett looked it over, commented that they "couldn't do it that way", but indicated that the ruling in the American Ship case, then in draft form, provided a premium for installing "Mineral wool (including glass) insulation." Ames countered that this was like saying "grain (including wheat) threshing" and urged them to make it "Mineral wool (including rock, glass or slag) insulation."

They were adamant on this point, however, and thought they were going a reasonable way to make this concession, although their attitude was entirely friendly.

Probably outcome is that the American Ship ruling will be issued with this award:

> "A premium of 11¢ per hour for workers actually engaged in installing mineral wool (including glass) insulation"

and that this phraseology will establish a pattern to be followed in the Federal Ship case and in an amendment to the Fiberglas item in the Tentative Conclusions of the Gulf Coast Wage Review.

It is urgently suggested that the Washington office keep in close touch with the Shipbuilding Commission and promptly relay to Toledo up-to-date and complete information on the status of all cases where our interests are affected.

In the meantime, Ames will undertake to follow through Hazard to Drinker or John Roche of the National Safety Council (Drinker and Roche wrote "Minimum Requirements") to see to it that an official supplement withdrawing the statement on Fiberglas is issued.

Meantime, too, it is suggested that the opportunity be made for Ames to present a story on this at the branch managers meeting November 30 - December 1 and 2, pointing out the implications of this situation, with special emphasis on the necessity of getting in bed with the unions (IUMSWA-CIO and Ship Carpenters-AFL) to stimulate them to invoke the precedent of the newly established, generalized, all-forms-of-mineral-wool pattern to awaken labor to its opportunity to extend the wage premium to rock wool and slag wool, if-and-when the need arises.

Our competition isn't going to like us, and we're going to have a fight on our hands with the rock wool - slag wool people when they wake up to what has happened. But unless we do this, we are going to be in a bad competitive position, and if we're going to have a fight, these tactics will make an industry fight, and not a lone company fight.

We must watch closely, too, to make sure that the pattern established by the Shipbuilding Commission along the lines indicated above is followed in each ruling, that the premium is granted on the basis of disagreeable conditions — confined working spaces, lack of ventilation, etc. — peculiar to the shipbuilding industry, and that the assumption of health hazard is expunged from the record. In this fight, we may be obliged to enlist the help of such men as Mr. Bowie, president of local 504 of the Ship Carpenters Union, New Orleans, of the international representative of this group (Henry Blumberg, Hotel Annapolis, Washington) and even of our romantic friend, Mr. Goldstein, attorney for IUMSWA, to get the pattern righted along proper lines.

EGV/dg Edward C. Ames

Draft of Resolution submitted Informally to Industry Members of Ship[illegible] in Washington, Nov. [illegible], 1944, to Amend Item on "Spun Glass and Fibre [illegible]" Conclusions of Gulf Zone Wage Review, dated Sept. 5, 1944.

Whereas "Spun Glass" or "Fibre Glass" or "glass wool" (Fiberglas) insulation is properly classified in the generic category of inorganic insulation materials known as "mineral wool" used in shipbuilding, as evidenced by such facts as the following:

1. It is so classified in Specification No. 32-MC-1 for "Insulation, Mineral Wool, blanket type," issued by the United States Maritime Commission February 14, 1944:

   "C.1. The material shall be mineral wool fibers, which shall be taken to include rock, glass or slag wool, or their mixtures."

2. It is so classified in the by-laws (Article VI) of the International Mineral Wool Institute, a trade association:

   "Mineral wool for industrial purposes, as referred to in the Constitution, shall be deemed to be Mineral Wool of rock, slag or glass origin..."

3. Since its manufacture began in 1938, it has been classified and shipped under the classification description of Mineral Wool at the freight rate applying to rock wool or slag wool.

and

Whereas the conditions encountered by workmen installing fiber glass wool insulation in the shipbuilding industry are not different from those encountered by workmen in the handling of other forms of Mineral Wool insulation, such as rock wool and slag wool,

and

Whereas it would be discriminatory against one type of Mineral Wool (glass wool) for a shipyard or contractor to pay a premium rate for its installation and to withhold approval of a similar premium for installing other types of Mineral Wool (rock wool and slag wool),

and

Whereas conditions peculiar to the shipbuilding industry frequently make it necessary for workmen to install the various forms and types of Mineral Wool insulation (rock, glass or slag) in confined spaces where it is difficult to dispose of scrap or to introduce adequate ventilation, thus creating unpleasant or disagreeable working conditions, although no actual health hazard is involved,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Shipbuilding Commission of the National War Labor Board, at a meeting in the City of Washington, D. C., this _____ day of November, 1944, hereby rescinds the following item in Section V (Premiums) of the Gulf Zone Wage Review ("Tentative Conclusions - Shipyards Covered by Our Zone Standards), dated September 5, 1944 (File 3997):

"Spun Glass and Fibre Glass
Employees actually working
with this material .10 per hour"

and substitutes for the foregoing item in said Section V (Premiums) the following:

"Mineral Wool Fibers, including rock, glass, or slag wool
Employees actually working
with these materials .10 per hour".

Review of Available Rulings by WSLB Shipbuilding Commission Granting Wage Premium for Installing Fiberglas Insulation.

Date and Case	Ruling
March 1, 1943 N.J. Case No. 51-A WLB No. 15-107 Sparo Shipbuilding Company (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)	"...in accordance with the request of the employer dated November 28, 1942, hereby approves a wage premium of 11¢ per hour above his regular hourly base rate of pay, for any employee while actually engaged in the hazardous handling or installation of spun glass and fiber glass, effective as of February 10, 1943."
February 10, 1943 Case No. 25-310-A In re John H. Mathis Company (Camden, New Jersey) and I.B.M.S.B.A.W. (CIO) Local 56	"I. A premium of $.11 per hour above the regular hourly base rate of pay is hereby approved for Carpenters while actually engaged in the hazardous handling or installation of spun glass and fiber glass."
July [illegible], 1943 Case No. 25-[illegible] In re American Car & Foundry Company (Wilmington, Delaware) and I.B.M.S.B.A.W. (CIO) Local [illegible]	"A premium of 10¢ per hour above the regular base rate for employees engaged in the installation of fiber glass insulation is hereby approved."
[illegible] [illegible] In re [illegible] Company [illegible] [illegible] (CIO) and [illegible] [illegible]	"[illegible] premium of 11¢ per hour for [illegible] engaged in the handling of spun glass or fiber glass is hereby [illegible]."
[illegible] [illegible] ([illegible]) In re American Shipbuilding Company ([illegible]) and International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 139 (AFL) et al.	"(1) A premium of 10¢ per hour is hereby awarded for employees while handling fiber glass insulation."

[illegible] hours terms and [illegible] thereabout.

September 7, 1944
Case No. [illegible]
1941-A
1942-A

In re Hopeman Brothers, Inc.
(Bethlehem Key Highway Yard)
(Bethlehem Sparrows Point Yard)
(Bethlehem Fairfield Yard)
(Baltimore, Maryland)
and
(C.I.O.) S.W.O.C. (CIO) Local 45, as bargaining agent in the Fairfield Yard.

[illegible] to their basic hourly rate is hereby approved for employees while working on ground blown glass or other hazardous types of insulation."

September 23, 1944
Case No. III-2305-D
(25-385-D)

In re Cramp Shipbuilding Company
(Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)
and
Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, (CIO) Local 42.

"Section 8. Employees while actually engaged in working with spun glass and fibre glass will receive eleven cents per hour above their regular hourly base rate."

Organization and Personnel of MMB Shipbuilding Commission

Offices: 6th Floor, 605 Indiana Avenue, Washington

Industry Members	Public Members	Labor Members
Lee G. Paul (West Coast attorney)	William H. McPherson (Cooper Union professor)	Edward F. Hayes (CIO to be backed by A. F. of L. Roseman)
Robert G. Howlett (attorney for N.Y. Ship and Penn-Jersey yards)	William E. Simkin (Bryn Mawr professor)	Easton Rothwell (CIO)
C. E. Middleton (v.p., Babcock & Wilcox)	Louis L. Jaffe Wallace Miller	James [illegible] (Pres. Int'l ISU)

Office of Industry Members: 720 20th Street, Washington
(Clerks: Mr. Adamson, Mr. Mitchell)

Hearings Officers: Frank Harris
Wallace Miller (public member, functions as hearings officer on West Coast)

Industry Alternates

Gulf Coast Area:

Harry Hill (Gulf Ship)
Mr. Gainer (Alabama Dry Dock, Mobile)
Mr. Lemley (Ingalls)
Mr. Hamill (Bangs)

Atlantic Coast Area:

J. H. Love (Potomac Ship)
Mr. Stevenson [illegible]

Great Lakes Area:

James Hughes (American Ship)

West Coast Area:

George Enchlein (Todd, Pacific)
Larry Rogge (Tacoma Ship)
Jack Murray (Kaiser)
Mr. Caffery (General Engrg. & Dry Dock)
Lee G. Paul (Attorney)