

DETROIT REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT RECORDS

BOX 3 OF 16

FOLDER 10

UAW LOCAL 961 GRIEVANCES
OTHER ISSUES 1968 1969

ELDON AVE. INT.-MFG. 12 - 4-15-69 (2nd step)

69-221 - A conspiracy to intimidate and discriminate against black worker
through their records (E-19)

Date presented: 3-25-69

Presented by: J. C. Thomas, ch. st.

GRIEVANCE:

It has occurred many time in the last year or so that management has deliberately discriminate against the black worker in Dept. 19 and other parts of the plant. On 1-23-69 there were many black worker paralyze on this date that good or very good attendance record. J. Jackson 19-5607 was given an oral warning on 1-23-69 for an unexcused absence, also many other. G. Shead 19-4311, C. Thompson, 19-4347, L. Norton, 19-5024, G. Dawson was wrote up given time off when there were not that and many more days off than him with an action being taken against them. Also there are some employees that has been excused many time, and some that can not get an excused absence under no condition. There has been many grievance wrote about the discrimination in this dept. 19. But seemly to have no affect on management in this district or in the plant.

There has been many black driver suspend for little or nothing or an unavoidable accident such as L. Norton, 19-5024 driver accidental hit the main door on the west side of the plant, and was given three days off, the same thing happen A. Rice a year ago with him getting five days. M. Daniels was given five days off for spilling a load of housing and bumping a retaining wall, Sam Hind was suspend for tipping over some faulty racks. There are many more off just such cases. But there is no white driver or afternoon has every lose any time regardless off the amount off damage they do. This union charge management with discrimination in the lowliest manner, and cannot be tolerate. And demand that every employees that lost time becaus off this discrimination be made whole for all lost time immediately.

ANSWER:

4- 25- 69

In this grievance the Union is charging Management with a conspiracy to intimidate and discriminate against black workers through their records.

Each case is judged on its own merit and merit alone. Management has not in the past and will not in the future use an employee's race or color to assess discipline.

Grievance denied.

ELDON AVENUE AXLE PLANT - LABOR RELATIONS MEETING NO. 32

(8-13-68) (Third Step)

GRV. #68-416 - Use of production employees as jitney
drivers (Dept. 19)

Date presented: 6-29-68

Presented by: J. U. Sims Plant Committeeman

GRIEVANCE:

FLAGRANT MISUSE AND VIOLATIONS OF LOCAL PLANT PRACTICES AND UNDERSTANDINGS!

It has long been the practice and understanding in this plant that the employees working out of Dept. 19 would and should handle and maintain all intra departmental material handling responsibilities! This included the shipping & receiving into and out of the plant, various supplies from 19 dept. receiving out to the various depts., transfer of materials between different depts., maintaining various banks, and in general, perform all material moves that require the services of a liscenced jitney driver. These drivers are to be cleared by our med. dept. and our safety office in order to drive our jitneys!

This union has found in the last month or so, the company, or some indiscriminate members of management, designating and using production employees as drivers on our jitneys, whenever and wherever they see FIT!

This union has protested and sought explanation verbally on the floor level with NO RESULTS! We now insist on an immediate cessation and explanations of these activities at once!

ANSWER:

In this grievance the union charges a violation of plant practices and understandings in that they claim management has assigned production employees to intra-department material handling duties, Jitney driving. They ask for a cessation and explanation of these activities.

Investigation reveals that on occasions, due to high absenteeism among the Jitney drivers or unusual work load, production employees who are qualified have been loaned to the material dept. and assigned to Jitney driving duties under the supervision of Material Supervisors. It is not unusual or improper to loan employees between departments. It is not intended that production employees should perform Jitney driver work when there are sufficient drivers to do such work. However, this is not to be interpreted as to prevent production employees who handle material within their department from continuing to do so, using whatever equipment is required, including jitneys.

69-353 - Violation Item 1, Memo of Understanding dated 11-30-67) (D-19)
Date presented: 5- 31- 69
Presented by: H. Willis, ch. st.

GRIEVANCE:

On Thurs. 5-19-69, employees G. A. Ray-B-19-7127, sen. 10-27-64, and W. L. Dufault-B-19-1495, sen. 2-5-68, both being jitney drivers, assigned work duties of a vigorous nature, and over-come by heat & exhausted; were denied their negotiated rights, as per "Item #1, Memorandum of Understanding on the part of Mr. R. Captain (Supervisor), Mr. R. Opalewski (Supervisor), Mr. T. Poplawski (gen'l. foreman), and the assistance of Mr. C. Polsgrove (Labor Relations Supervisor), and the Medical Dept.

This union's investigation finds, that the language is clear and the spirit of intent of item #1 and was never designed for management's criterion soley; being that the union is aware of the polemic and spurious attitude of management especially when their actions clearly illustrate their intention of a mulct nature and promulgate; therefore, this union requests the greatest degree of consideration for healthy reasons and in the future to comply with item #1 of the Memorandum of understanding...
Temperature-5-29-69 - 90/ (outside).

ANSWER:

7-21-69

In this grievance the Union is charging Management with violation of Item #1, Memorandum of Understanding, dated 11-30-67.

Employees G. A. Ray, 19-7127, and W. Dufault, 19-1494 were both given the opportunity on 5-29-69, to be treated by the Medical Department.

The agreement states: "Requests by individual employees for a pass to leave the plant because of hot weather will be granted by the foreman provided the circumstances surrounding the request appears reasonable."

Considering the temperature, which was less than that stated by the Union, and the area in which these employees were assigned, Management did not feel the circumstances surrounding the request were reasonable. Therefore, there was no violation of the Agreement.

Grievance denied.