

ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

with

T. EARL KINNEY

February 7, 1973
Washington, D.C.

Interviewer: Alice M. Hoffman

INTRODUCTION

In 1929 T. Earl Kinney obtained his first job as a delivery boy in the printing division of the Sun Publishing Company in Vancouver, British Columbia. Eventually he became a letter press apprentice and a member of the Amalgamated Lithographers of America, Local 44, in 1939, where he has been a member ever since. In 1945 Kinney became vice-president of this local.

In 1945 Local 44 withdrew from the AFL-affiliated Trades and Labor Congress in Vancouver and joined the CIO-affiliated Vancouver Labor Council. Kinney tells of the struggle to avoid domination by Communist groups in this organization. He describes how Local 44, in order to survive financially, had to obtain a subsidy from the International Council.

In 1952 Kinney became president of Local 44. He explains the jurisdictional problems that the Lithographers had with the International Typographical Union (ITU) during the fifties, which went to the extreme of Local 44 crossing the picket lines of ITU and defying the wishes of the International in order to stand firm in its position. The Supreme Court of Canada finally denied the ITU the right to negotiate for the Lithographers' jurisdiction.

In 1962 Kinney was elected an International Councillor of his union. He describes the system whereby councillors are elected from distinct geographical regions and how merger with the International Photoengravers' Union of North America (IPEU) affected councillor representation. He discusses the workings of the International Council Board which is made up of councillors and officers of the union. He also discusses the workings of the Technological Development Committee, of which he is a member, its task, and its relationship with manufacturers.

INTERVIEW WITH T. EARL KINNEY

Date: February 7, 1973

Place: Washington, D.C.

Interviewer: Alice M. Hoffman

KINNEY: Do you want my full name?

INTERVIEWER: Please.

KINNEY: Thomas Earl Kinney. Born in Vancouver, British Columbia, December 30, 1912.

INTERVIEWER: Mr. Kinney, do you want to start out with 1929 with your first job as a delivery boy? And give us some idea of how you came to get that job in particular as opposed to some other job you might have gotten?

KINNEY: Yes. In my schooling I attended secondary school of vocational or technical. . . it was called a technical school-Vancouver Technical School. And I specialized in printing. And at the age of 16, because of family circumstances. I decided to seek employment and made application to the Sun Publishing Company, printing division.

INTERVIEWER: Sun?

KINNEY: Sun Publishing. . . for a job in printing. There were no apprenticeships open. I was offered a job as delivery boy for some nine or ten months and was moved from that position to general helper in the printing press room, letter press. The

company had no lithographing equipment at that time. And I only vaguely knew what lithographing was.

INTERVIEWER: It was not a part of your technical training in school?

KINNEY: No. Technical training had not advanced to that degree at that time. It was confined mostly to the setting of type and to the operating of a platen letter press, hand feeding. . .

INTERVIEWER: Hand feeding?

KINNEY: Hand feeding, yes. And my job in the letter press department was that of washing up the presses, taking the rollers out and washing them up, and bringing the chases over to the presses and assisting the. . .

INTERVIEWER: What's a chase?

KINNEY: A chase is a metal form in which they lock up the type in position for the purpose of placing it on the press in a form which will not disintegrate when the press starts to operate. And generally speaking the mixing of ink, the type-highing of cuts, washing of rollers, the sweeping of floors, and general, "Joe."

I continued in that for some time and reached the position where I was learning to hand feed letter press cylinder presses. In 1933 they installed an offset press--24 1/2, 37 1/2 crab tree--and the letter press union (that's the IPP & AU) claimed jurisdiction, sent the foreman down to Tennessee to the Pressmen's Home to learn to operate an offset press. When he came back, he. . . all of the feeder operators in the Letter Press Department who had a try at operating the feeder on the lithopress, were unsuccessful, and they gave me an opportunity, and I was able to make the feeder operate, so therefore I got the job. The letter press foreman who had gone to Tennessee couldn't operate the press, and so finally they employed a pressman from the Lithographers Union from outside the company to come in and operate the press. And they insisted he join the IPP and AU, which he refused to do. They gave me an application to join the IPP & AU and I turned it down.

INTERVIEWER: Why? Why did you turn it down?

KINNEY: Because in my opinion--and this is personal--I believed that. . . I thought at that time I had been discriminated against by not being accepted on that press for a permanent position because I was. . . of the other feeders in the plant, any one of them would have had the job except that they couldn't operate it. And when I was given the opportunity and could operate it, and they wanted me to join their organization, I said no dice. I wanted to join the Lithographers Union.

INTERVIEWER: Did you have any sense that lithography was a coming thing when you made that decision?

KINNEY: Well, sure, because it was a new innovation in the company. It was something new to grow with.

INTERVIEWER: Uh-hm.

KINNEY: Whereas the letter press had been there for many, many years and seniority and those other things would preclude me from having a position within the firm, I thought that I could gain there--selfish motivation. And I retained that job until such time as the company ran short of the ability to gain pressmen for second and third shifts and then I went on to operated the press as a press apprentice, if you will, without the benefit of a formal apprentice indenture.

INTERVIEWER: And without benefit of union affiliation?

KINNEY: Yes. I found it difficult because the Lithographers would not accept me into membership; would not accept me into membership, would not accept anyone into membership unless they held a journeyman's card either as a pressman or a hand trencher. And it was not until 1939 that my application was accepted, four years after I had been working on the press. And I became a union member of the Amalgamated Lithographers of America, Local 44, in 1939. I've been a member ever since.

INTERVIEWER: How big a local was Local 44 at that time?

KINNEY: Some fifty active members, I would assume or guess. I think my number was eighty-two, but they had never replaced numbers; in other words, a fella had a number when he joined the local and if he left the local or died or retired, his number was never re-issued. So it was a very small local; might not even have been fifty active people.

From that point forward, from the point of view of trade union affiliation, I became an officer of the local as secretary-treasurer or treasurer in 1941.

INTERVIEWER: Were you still employed at Sun?

KINNEY: Yes. In fact, my employment with Sun. . . I had twenty years with Sun before I left them. I became vice-president of the organization in 1945 at which time. . . during all this period the terms of office were one year, not two. Served one term as vice-president and did not run for office for the following term in any capacity. And in 1949 ran for and became vice-president once again, and again ran for office of president in 1951; became elected; ran again for office in 1952 and became elected as the full-time officer of Local 44.

INTERVIEWER: I wonder if you would want to describe the local union in terms of. . . well, for one thing, its militancy, in terms of its activities with other labor organizations in the area.

KINNEY: Well, during the thirties and the forties the local identified itself by belonging to the Trades and Labor Congress which was in effect at that time--A.F. of L. And, of course, in 1945, after our dispute with the A.F. of L. and the International withdrawing from the A.F. of L. and joining the C.I.O., the local followed suit and withdrew from the A.F. of L. or from the Trades and Labor Congress, which was the affiliation with the A.F. of L., the Canadian affiliation with the Vancouver Labor Council, a branch of the Trades and Labor Congress. We withdrew from all those organizations and joined the C.I.O. and its affiliates which had a B.C. Federation of Labor and a Labor Council, Vancouver Labor Council, which had newly been born with the advent of the CIO and was of not very great strength; was gaining strength.

Although the local identified itself with these people, paid per capita tax, they participated very little until about 1949 when I became vice-president. I insisted that we have delegation at these levels and participated with the Vancouver Labor Council in its struggle for domination. . . struggle to avoid the domination of the communist groups, at which time it was rather serious business in our eyes and rather comical when you look back at it. Those of the left, whether they be card-carrying communists or whether by be people who just went along because of the extremely liberal ideas that these people had, used to attend these meetings; and they would merely try to filibuster the meetings to the point of making them last 'til midnight or later so that the majority of the people who were working on the job would have left the meeting and they could control the vote. And it became a case where who could outlast who. And some pretty husky meetings took place during that period of time.

And during that period of time, The International Woodworkers of America, and Steelworkers, and a few others were engaged in some pretty bloody battles, suing some pretty heavy material for weapons, to try to influence the people to their point of view and were successful in getting out the Communist dictators. . . or I shouldn't use the word "dictator," should I? or the communist influence in their locals. We must remember that, although the Communist Party is outlawed in the United States, it's not outlawed in Canada; it is a political party. And the Communist Party as such, and the extreme left in conjunction with them, have been attempting for a great number of years to destroy the international unions, create national unions, because they could then get in control of those unions because they are a political party in Canada and recognized by the government of Canada and by the police establishments and security establishments of the country.

And our affiliation and work with the Central Labor Body has been from that period of time; and although in any given time our participation was not too active, we always have participated when we were eligible to. And whenever a crisis of any nature arose in the labor movement or between our organization and some other, we exercised our option to be active and participated at that time in all of the conventions of the provincial labor body and have a few times participated in the central labor body of the AFL-CIO, called the Canadian Labor Congress.

Going on from there, I would think that probably the next significant factor in the life or history of the Vancouver Local of this organization was when another fellow and I attended the 1951 convention in Dallas, Texas and appealed to the International Council for a subsidy; gained that subsidy . . .

INTERVIEWER: What was the basis of the appeal? How did you have to go about making that kind of appeal?

KINNEY: We approached the International Council, explained to them what our finances were, and we explained to them what the potential in the area was to the best of our knowledge, the number of paid-up members that we had in the local at that time, and as to whether the local could raise the dues structure to the degree that would support a paid officer once the subsidy had been approved. It was an oral presentation, and the request was successful. A subsidy was provided, provided that the local elected a person that was . . . that could devote full time to the job and would devote full time and was prepared to carry on.

We returned from the convention, which was held --if my memory serves me right--in September. And I declared the position of president open, called for nominations, had an election, and was successful in being elected to that position, taking office. . .

INTERVIEWER: Did you have an opposition?

KINNEY: Yes. I had opposition, not very serious opposition, but the person that was opposing me was serious enough. I took office in January, 1952. I have remained as their principal officer, president of the local since that time.

INTERVIEWER: How long did the International have to continue the subsidy?

KINNEY: The subsidy was for one year at fifty dollars a week. And at the end of that period of time, local's financial picture wasn't as substantial as it should be to carry the expense of a paid office, and it was completely dissimilar from any subsidy of today's dates.

INTERVIEWER: Well, now, was this a supplementary subsidy, or did this mean the International paid the total . . .

KINNEY: Well, the International paid the local fifty dollars a week, and the local was to make up any difference that there was in the wages. And when I took office, if the International had, for any reason, been delinquent in their payment to the local of the subsidy, I'm sure that my wages wouldn't have been paid; there wasn't enough in the treasury. And my wages were not very substantial.

In any event, at the end of that first year, the end of the year that the subsidy was to continue, I made a written appeal for an extension of six months so we could get our financial house a little better in order. And it was granted. The subsidy was removed after the six months, so we had been on subsidy for eighteen months.

The next event was the matter of going into negotiations immediately I took office. And we were proposing a substantial wage increase. In 1952 we asked for . . . I think it was 50¢ an hour, a one-year agreement. And we finally struck the principal shops, two principal shops. . .

INTERVIEWER: Excuse me, did you, at this time, engage in some kind of coordinated bargaining with the employers or did you bargain with each of them separately?

KINNEY: We were bargaining through an association of sorts. three employers took it on themselves to bargain for everybody else without permission of the other employers. It was two of the employers who were on the negotiating committee whom we struck.

The strike lasted four and a half days. We were successful in gaining 32¢ an hour on a one-year agreement with no improvement in any other conditions.

INTERVIEWER: You mean 32 additional cents. . . (laughter)

KINNEY: Yes. And in those days there were no labor laws that prohibited you from striking the day you gave your notice. In other words, you took a strike vote which had to be supervised by the Government Labor Department; and the moment that the tally was given, you could issue your strike notice on the firm and be on the street the same day. We did. The vote was tallied in each of these shops by 3:30 p.m., and we had a picket line in front of both plants by 5:00 p.m., which was the starting time of the afternoon shift. And we were successful in gaining the 32¢ inside of four and a half days. When I say four and a half days, it was because it was only four days for the night shift and four and a half days for the day shift.

And the following year the economic position was very bad and the employment had not been good, and we negotiated for a health-and-welfare program in 1952. And, I believe, a monetary increase for 1954. In 1955 we bargained for wages in the first year of the agreement and a pension plan for 1956, to begin in 1956; developed a locally-based, jointly-trusted pension plan.

This takes us into the period of time in which we ran into difficulties with the ITU with respect to jurisdictional problems. After returning from the convention in Boston, where we had learned of the ITU's new constitutional laws which made reference to the new "process" (in quotes,) which in actual fact was their definition of the lithographic trade, on returning to Vancouver, I made moves to correct our jurisdictional language; and the ITU made proposals for our jurisdiction in a number of plants in the city, all of the plants in which they had contracts. And the companies granted their request in a peculiar manner, in which they agreed to implement their jurisdiction over certain phases of the preparatory branch of the lithography on the last day of their agreement.

Skipping lightly over that year. . .

INTERVIEWER: Now, let me understand. These plants had fairly recently introduced lithographic processes. . .

KINNEY: This was in '50. . . some odd. . . and they had now had it for a number of years. . .

INTERVIEWER: They had had it for a while?

KINNEY: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: And who had had the workers on these lithographic presses?

KINNEY: Oh, it was our jurisdiction and under contract to us and we had the people.

INTERVIEWER: Uh-hm. Okay. So this was open declared warfare.

KINNEY: That's right. And we advised the companies that the day that they turned this work over to the ITU, they would have a picket line in front of their plants.

INTERVIEWER: What would be the motivation for the companies changing their, . . . that is, their willingness to go along with ITU?

KINNEY: To postpone the advent of a strike by either the ITU or ourselves.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

KINNEY: So they postponed their problems for a year after signing the agreement. And on the last day of that agreement, or prior to the last day of that agreement, they phoned us up and wanted to know -- if they turned it over to the ITU on a . . . and it happened to expire on Friday . . . for the Friday, would we work, provided they turned the work back to us and that we could redo any work that they had done on the Friday, on the Saturday at double time?

INTERVIEWER: (Laughter)

KINNEY: And that we would continue to do the work and that they would turn the work back to us for the following period of time.

INTERVIEWER: What a crazy plan! I don't understand the motivation for such backwards and forwards. . .

KINNEY: Well, they knew that they would have the lithographers on the street immediately following the turning over of that work. . .

INTERVIEWER: Right.

KINNEY: By that time they had determined that they would prefer to have the ITU on the street than the Lithographers.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

KINNEY: And so they turned the work back to us. The ITU did not strike at that time. They went into negotiations and with rewording their jurisdictional clause and leaving out any loopholes whereby they would be turned over for only a matter of twenty-four hours. At that time the International assigned Vice-President Wallace and Assistant-to-the-President Kenneth Brown to come into Vancouver. . .

INTERVIEWER: Who was the president at that time?

KINNEY: Of our International?

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

KINNEY: Slater. . . to come into Vancouver and to sit down with the ITU and to work out the jurisdictional question to avoid conflict. And Vice-President Wallace and Assistant-to-the-President Kenneth Brown came to Vancouver and met with their counterparts from the ITU, international counterparts from the ITU, along with a local committee from both the ITU and the Lithographers; spent many weeks at various times trying to develop language which would be compatible to protecting the jurisdiction of each union.

INTERVIEWER: Now, how did that come about? Did the local union president in Vancouver and yourself each approach your internationals or did the initiative for this kind of joint exploration come from two international offices? (Interruption. . .) The initiation came from the . . .?

KINNEY: A complaint from the International Typographical Union to our international offices in respect to the jurisdictional question or jurisdictional lines that were being crossed in Vancouver. In any event, we were unsuccessful; although many times we had reached agreement verbally, the ITU refused to sign the document that would have made it feasible for us to agree with them. And the ITU struck four of the plants in Vancouver, the largest of these being Evergreen Press; put picket lines

around them, and we crossed them, which became a very obnoxious position for our International to be in as well as the local to be in. And the International was pressing me to find some means of staying outside of the line. And our local was not inclined to say outside of the line when it was our jurisdiction that was at stake. If we supported the strike and it was successful, then it would have been successful in taking away our jurisdiction and we weren't about to do it!

And so, consequently, this conflict went on. And inadvertantly or otherwise, we found people who were willing to go in and handle that composing room work. We handled their work. And this upset our International to the degree that the then lawyer of the International called me into New York City.

INTERVIEWER: This was Mr. Robinson?

KINNEY: Right. And really lowered the boom and told me to back off and to come to agreement with the ITU, which I respectfully declined to do. . .

INTERVIEWER: On what basis did he want you to come to agreement with the ITU? Did he want you to surrender or did he want you to make some accommodations?

KINNEY: On any basis that would take the International off the hook of having one of their locals crossing this line and assisting a company to beat them. And although it wasn't the most attractive position to be in--to have your men crossing another union's picket lines--it was the only visible means that I could find to protect the jurisdiction and the jobs of the people in Vancouver. And that was what I was employed to do and that's what it's all about when you lead an organization.

And they called me into New York again to meet with the . . . well, they had a meeting with the president and the lawyer of the ITU, a fellow by the name of Van Arkle. We went at it for two days; finally came to some pretty harsh words and. . .

INTERVIEWER: What kind of offers of settlement did they make?

KINNEY: None.

INTERVIEWER: They didn't move to compromise with you at all?

KINNEY: No, they strictly claimed it was their jurisdiction.

INTERVIEWER: On what basis if it was lithography?

KINNEY: That it was an extension of their previous jobs. Where it used to be run in hot metal, it was now being run by lithographic process and therefore it was an evolution of their job. And instead of them being able to make it up in type, it was now being stripped up and it was now being photographed and plates were being made when they used to make up the complete locked-up form for the press. And consequently it was an evolution of their job that they claimed and they wanted it.

INTERVIEWER: On the same basis that [William] Hutcheson claims all kinds of things--that if it used to be made out of wood, it belongs to the carpenters.

KINNEY: The analogy of that time that I put to them was that it doesn't necessarily follow that, because airplanes are flying today, that engineers of the locomotives are flying those airplanes.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

KINNEY: And in any event, we went back to Vancouver and we struggled with this. And we had meetings with the ITU many, many times and with their international officers as well. And an international representative was assigned to come into Vancouver and meet with these people along with myself, and they always wound up with very bitter results. In any event, I was called into the Canadian Labor Congress by the CLC to see if they could resolve this matter, and I told them it was easy to resolve it--get them to remove that jurisdictional clause from their contract, and we would support the strike and the strike would be over.

In any event, they refused to do it. And we took an injunction against them. The company took an injunction against them. And they were denied the right to negotiate for our jurisdiction.

INTERVIEWER: By whom?

KINNEY: By the courts, the Supreme Court of Canada.

INTERVIEWER: Uh-hm. In other words, it was the same situation as it was in this country, that the separation of the techniques. . . you were able to make the case before the courts on the basis of the separation of the techniques.

KINNEY: That's correct. And on the existing labor agreements primarily and our certifications for bargaining authority.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. Okay.

KINNEY: And although they were prohibited by the court from putting in writing any demands or from continuing to make demands for that jurisdiction, they continued to strike and told the company that settlement could only be reached if the contract included all of the matters that the company was aware of that the ITU required to have for a complete contract. And avoiding the use of the names and the terms of the jurisdiction or the terms that they used in their jurisdictional clause.

In any event, I took a trip down to Ottawa and advised Ottawa--that is, the CLC--that if they didn't get the ITU off my back, I was going to organize the composing room at Evergreen Press! (Laughter) And of course, their official position had to be "no," and their posture had to be in the labor movement that we were the aggressor.

In any event, the conditions remained the same for approximately another year. And I believe in 1962 we organized that plant, that department of the plant, about fifty compositors. But prior to going in and accepting applications from these people or going through any of the motions of organizing or applying for certification, I notified the International that I was going to do it. I didn't ask their blessing because I didn't feel that officially they were able to do so. I notified the executive vice-president of the CLC that I was going to do it on the same basis--without asking a blessing. And went forward and organized these people, applied for certification, was certified, and bargained a contract for them. . .

(End of Side I)

INTERVIEWER: Well, this fits in with the remark that you had made previously before we started this tape-- that you had been engaged in industrial organization all along throughout the whole history of this local and this therefore fits in with the whole local's philosophy of. . .

KINNEY: We already had compositors in our local prior to this time. The fact is we had just lost a long, lengthy strike at the Mitchell Press where we had the complete composing room of about twenty people. It was a sad affair; it was an affair that was mixed up whereby we didn't get the support that we should get at the time we went on strike, and there were other graphic arts unions crossing the line and going in and working, which gave the company the opportunity to scab and replace our one department

while the others were accepting work from anywhere and doing the work. And therefore we lost the strike, a strike which was joined by the Bookbinders Union some five or six months after we'd gone on strike, was joined by them but the strike had been lost by us by that time. In other words, we weren't. . . we were still picketing, still striking, but the impact of the strike was gone. If the Bookbinders had come out at the time we went out, I think we would have--hindsight is much easier than foresight--and I think now that we would have been able to win that strike.

However, a number of these people had lost their jobs; and when we finally called the picket line off at Mitchell Press, these fellows drifted out of our union because we had no jobs for them and found their way into Evergreen Press. And so consequently, we didn't have a very difficult time with these people at Evergreen Press in organizing because some of them had been members of ours previously.

INTERVIEWER: Well, that doesn't necessarily follow. They might have been turned off by this whole business! (Laughter)

KINNEY: That's true. And at the time that the strike occurred at Evergreen Press, some of the fellows who were members of our union were expelled from the union because they went and took jobs at this plant. We expelled them.

INTERVIEWER: Which plant did they take jobs at?

KINNEY: At Evergreen Press.

INTERVIEWER: At Evergreen Press.

KINNEY: Even though we were not honoring the picket line, we weren't advocating scabbing by any of our members.

INTERVIEWER: Mr. Kinney, I can foresee that you had some very difficult explaining to do in the local union.

KINNEY: Local union? The International mostly. The local union I could handle, but the International took a very dim view of a lot of this. In any event, the strike lasted until some 1962 or '63. And in the interim period I became elected as an international councillor after the convention of 1961 in Miami.

INTERVIEWER: This was a regional election?

KINNEY: Yes. I was elected to represent the West Coast.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

KINNEY: But it was an international election.

INTERVIEWER: Okay. How does that fit in with your previous statement that the International took a dim view of some of your activity?

KINNEY: Well, they took a pretty dim view of it, and many actions seemed to be toward excommunication, you know. At the same time, I was a pretty strong advocate of internationalism and international union and of the international activities and implemented those activities in all our locals. And I had been an officer of my local for some time and had gained some experience and some following in local circles because of my. . . what might you say. . . renegade activities? Or maybe that's a very poor word. Maybe we ought to scrub that one off the tape and say because of my liberal approach to some of the questions. In any event. . .

INTERVIEWER: Some of the questions--like what?

KINNEY: Industrial organizing, the manner which I followed in running the organization, the fact that I wasn't turned off everytime somebody said "no." (First thing you know I'm gonna get a swelled chest, talking like this!)

INTERVIEWER: (Laughter)

KINNEY: However, I think for those reasons and the fact that I was young and reasonable aggressive probably. Young. . . hell, I wasn't really that young!

INTERVIEWER: The penalty of competence, we'll say.

KINNEY: I don't know about competence, either, but in any event. . . I'll lose my train of thought here if I'm not careful. Maybe we'd better turn it off for a minute. . .

INTERVIEWER: Well, you had just mentioned that you were elected as an international representative. . .

KINNEY: No, international councillor.

INTERVIEWER: Councillor, right. Did you immediately undertake the committee assignment on the Technological Development Committee? Was that . . .

KINNEY: I can't recall. The records will show that; international records will show that. I just don't recall. I've got a sneaking notion that . . . there was a year, the first year as a councillor before I was appointed to that. And I believe that Ken appointed me to that after the first year. I'm not sure. I can't recall exactly.

I also was a member of the Finance Committee on the International for a number of years.

(Interruption on the tape.)

INTERVIEWER: Let's back up a little bit and tape a segment here which we will insert into our discussion of industrial organization. You were telling me, while we had the tape turned off, that you were operating in a somewhat different legal climate in British Columbia than in the United States or even elsewhere in Canada with respect to what the legal definition of jurisdiction. . . Do you want to redefine it for me?

KINNEY: Yes. Well, our first entry into industrial organizing was the case where in 1946 and 1947 we were in the process of organizing two label houses or houses that specialized in producing food and liquor labels. And in organizing these plants, we ran into employees who were employed as compositors, letter pressmen, cutting machine operators, and female help who did the finishing of the product--the sorting of the labels, the wrapping, typing--a segment of bindery work. And because of the Labor Act of British Columbia at that time, although the act did provide for carving out units, craft units, the board itself had a view that was to permit carve-outs only when the balance of the people were organized into other craft units, and that if the plant in question being organized was not represented by any union, then you should apply for all employees except those that were organized or those who were excluded by the Act, or, in their eyes, excludable because of the nature of their employment which did not lend itself to union organization, such as salesmen and office staff.

When the local ran into this, they offered to the ITU, the Printing Pressmen, and the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, these employees who would normally fall within their jurisdiction. And each of those unions declined to participate and to organize these people on the basis that they had not been apprenticed through their trade, were not qualified craftsmen in their view, and that they did not want to take them in as members, and therefore declined to participate in any manner, although at that time--even at that time--there was the opportunity for pooling party certifications, which meant a number of unions could apply for a common certification.

The local went forward and organized these people with the assistance of an international vice-president. And this became the basis of industrial organizing in the city of Vancouver Local 44. The law being preferential toward industrial units as they are today made it more difficult to organize a craft unit and define that unit in such a way that would give us jurisdictional protection by spelling out each classification and job function. And wherever we found a shop that was not organized by some other union or not partially organized by some other union, we took the whole shop in organizing and filed for an overall certification for all employees, normally, except office staff and salesmen. Although we have made other exceptions when we find that one department may have been organized for a great length of time by another union--or for any length of time, for that matter--we would exclude those employees who were covered by a certification.

INTERVIEWER: And as you gained experience with this, you could see, obviously, especially after your experience with the jurisdictional battles with the ITU, the advantages in not having to be concerned with who was working and who was not working in the union.

KINNEY: Yes, we could very early see the advantages of having a complete shop under contract and under certification. Because if you had to put economic pressure on this company at the time of negotiations, then you controlled the whole shop, which had a better strength and better application in collective bargaining than having to depend on some other union to support any economic action that you might take.

INTERVIEWER: Right. In addition to which, in terms of public support and even the support of your own members, it's got to be confusing to try to instruct people that they can cross some picket lines, and others, they can't. I mean, that's got to be a rather difficult lesson to impart to a community.

KINNEY: Yes, we've been skating that thin line for a number of years. It is extremely difficult to impart knowledge to union members that some picket lines are not to be crossed and others, through the designation of the local, must be crossed to protect your jurisdiction.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

KINNEY: And we've progressed through the years in this industrial organizing to the point where a great number of firms. . . we are certified for the firm from the front door to the back door. And have a contract covering every classification in the graphic arts, other than rotogravure, (of which there is none in Vancouver), and many that don't have an application toward the lithographic trade. We have a shop organized in Vancouver that makes carbon paper for the trade. And all they do is make carbon paper. We find it somewhat difficult to assess their value in relation to wages when we bargain for these people, and sometimes we get them so far out in front of people of equal skill and ability in like-type jobs throughout the city, in both fringe benefits and wages, by using our craft contract as a comparison and sometimes to a point of embarrassment when you don't know what to do about it if they fall out of employment.

In any event, we have every branch of the graphic arts trade represented in our union, and uniquely we have one-base rates established and every branch of the Graphic Arts Union that is a craft is on the base rate or higher. This is to say that typographical people, printing press people, cutting machine operators, folding machine operators, journeymen bindery men, if you will--and I know that that's not normal right now by the Fair and Equal Employment Act--receive the same wages as strippers, assemblers, black and white camera operators, and platemakers, single color pressmen, litho pressmen. Whereas in most areas in which you travel, you find that the printing pressmen, the IPP & AU representing them, the compositors represented by the ITU earn a substantially lesser wage than do the Lithographers. That's not so in Vancouver. And it was we that established that parity with the ITU and the Bookbinders and the Printing Pressmen, using our contracts as comparisons to get their people level with our rates.

INTERVIEWER: Well, I begin to see a little bit the tie-in between your arguments with the International and your moving into the job as councillor because obviously the directions that you were taking in Vancouver were directions which the rest of the International sort of came to as they could see that this was the wave of the future.

KINNEY: Yes, I've had the comment made to me that I was coming into my own, type of thing, as far as my philosophy was concerned. In any event, the International now is moving in that direction and moving quickly in that direction. It's not for me to say as to whether belatedly or otherwise because I think, had we taken that approach a number of years ago, we'd have been further down the path today than we are and we'd not have been confronted with the jurisdictional disputes that we've had.

INTERVIEWER: Well, do you think, though, that to a certain extent you got away with it because of your relative isolation in Vancouver? I mean, if you had tried to do the same thing in St. Louis or New York, don't you think. . .

KINNEY: Well, in the powerhouses, yes; but in the other areas, no. As far as Vancouver was concerned, Vancouver was used by the ITU for the past. . . up until the last five years and from that period backwards for the past thirty years, as the testing ground and the implementation position of all of their new innovations and/or their breaking of hours and things of that nature.

INTERVIEWER: What was that?

KINNEY: Because a militant local, very militant local, the home local of the first vice-president of the ITU and a local that had a habit of winning strikes, which is not a great habit of the ITU. And therefore we were up against some pretty stiff opposition in Vancouver in that respect. And [we were] a very small and ineffective, if you will, local in the twenties and thirties and early forties because of our size and the limit of our trade within the area and the confinement to the straight craft line.

INTERVIEWER: Well, if I can summarize, would you agree with this summary that, as the technology of the industry changed and lithography became more important. . . however, Local 44 was vigorously, in the late forties and early fifties, protecting its jurisdiction.

KINNEY: Right.

INTERVIEWER: So that the relative strength of the ITU and the ALA began to be more equalized?

KINNEY: That's right.

INTERVIEWER: Well, why don't we get back to your coming on as councillor. I had asked you if you could explain how the councillors are chosen.

KINNEY: They're appointed. . . no, how the councillors are chosen?

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. I've found it a little confusing, frankly.

KINNEY: Councillors are apportioned to the regions by their percentage of the total membership. For each ten percent of the membership, an area is entitled to one councillor. The Atlantic region, being for many years the most highly populated or densely populated of all of the regions, was entitled to the most councillors. The central region, of which Chicago is the hub, was entitled to the next largest number of councillors. The mountain region was next. The Pacific region and the Canadian region were entitled to one councillor for each, not having ten percent. . . were not greater than. . . It's ten percent or the major portion thereof. Each region was entitled to a minimum of one.

INTERVIEWER: Okay. That one was selected by the entire membership?

KINNEY: No. Each region voted (and only the region was entitled to vote) for its councillor, for its council representative.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

KINNEY: And in 1961, at the time when I let my name stand for councillor, the Atlantic region was entitled to four councillors; the mountain was entitled to one councillor, the central region, three councillors, the Pacific region entitled to one, and the Canadian region entitled to one. It wasn't until the advent of the. . . I've lost the word. . . the advent of the merger between the . . .

INTERVIEWER: Photoengravers?

KINNEY: The Photoengravers and the Lithographers wherein the merger document provided that the Photoengravers would have their apportionment of councillors, that the number of councillors increased. But just prior to merger or at the time of merger, the New York local pulled out of the ALA, which threw the balance

of the proportion of membership--using these ten percent figures --over to the central region whereby the central region then became entitled to four councillors, (ALA) and the Atlantic region, three. Therefore the central region became the largest region; and the old Local One (ALA), the New York local, pulling out, the Chicago local became the largest local in the organization. But at that time the three small areas, the three small regions, numerically, became entitled to another councillor, a Photoengraver councillor. So the mountain region, the Pacific region, and the Canadian region each were entitled to one councillor from the old ALA and one councillor from the old IPEU.

Well, our local, although it's in Canada, is in the Pacific region. And I ran for Pacific region councillor and was elected there. The Canadian region extends from the Alberta border to Newfoundland or to actually Nova Scotia, I suppose. And the Toronto local president is the Lithographer--if you will --councillor. And the Toronto councillor was the secretary-treasurer of the Photoengraving local there, Local 35P.

I think that pretty well defines the manner in which councillors are elected.

INTERVIEWER: Are they elected by referendum vote?

KINNEY: Referendum vote at the same time that all the officers are elected to the organization, the international organization. And it's quite a competitive, political position, if you will. And there's been some pretty husky debates on the Council, which I'm pleased to have participated in. And it became what we thought was a very, very large council when we merged with the IPEU. But compared to the small "convention" that a Council Board meeting is today since the merger with the Bookbinders, it was relatively small.

INTERVIEWER: You ended up after merger with IPEU with twenty councillors, is that right? It doubled the number of councillors?

KINNEY: No, twenty-five.

INTERVIEWER: Twenty-five.

KINNEY: Because the council includes every international officer, you know. I shouldn't say councillors. The Council Board ended up with twenty-five members on it.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

KINNEY: Councillors were fifteen. International councillors were fifteen, and officers were ten, giving a total of twenty-five. And that was originally founded on the basis that the balance of power on the Board, as far as the vote was concerned, rested with the elected councillors from the regions rather than a block of officers. And that was on the basis of three-to-two. That was diluted somewhat in this latest Council, although there still is, and will be, a majority of councillors as opposed to officers representing on the Council for the big test, if you will. In my experience in the ten years I was on the Council, I never found any reason to think that that was necessary.

INTERVIEWER: Did it happen that sometimes the secretary-treasurer would vote with a group of councillors, and sometimes another group of councillors would be on another side with the president? Did that occur?

KINNEY: I don't think in that type of issue. The president actually didn't vote, doesn't vote, unless he found it necessary to break a tie and he usually finds some way around it. Because if it's that darn close, you know, well, there's no unanimity of opinion.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

KINNEY: I would say that the programs and policies brought down by the president were agreed to in a majority of instances; not always without modification. I would say that there were officers who supported amendments to a proposal or a policy rather than saying that all officers came in as a block and voted for the proposal carte blanche. There were officers and are officers who support amendments to a policy that's brought in by the president, but I do believe that under the new setup where they're going to have not just a Council Board, but also an executive committee of the Council Board, which will be all of the officers, there may be more unanimity of thinking of the officers when a policy's brought in than there was previously. Though I'm not trying to suggest to you that the officers didn't meet in advance of a Council meeting and thrash something out. It's quite possible that this reflected the fact that. . .

INTERVIEWER: They didn't all live in the same place. . .

KINNEY: No, but that didn't matter. They'd call a meeting for Miami, or some place like that for the officers prior to a Council meeting or probably in the city where the Council meeting was going to be. We used to move these Council meetings around from place to place. We might meet in Phoenix or we might meet in Chicago or Montreal or some place, or Mont Tremblant, some place like that.

I think that probably in the cases where officers were prone to maybe supporting an amendment, it was either spontaneous because they thought the amendment altered the policy or proposition or bettered it, or that it supported their view at the officers' meeting at which they were outvoted and possibly they fell in line with it because somebody else had the same idea they did. I'm not suggesting that there's any collusion or anything else in this because I honestly can tell you right now that I have never been able to witness any such things since the Local One left the organization. I can't say that for the whole time I was on the Council.

INTERVIEWER: The first two years you were on the Council, Local One was in?

KINNEY: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: Well, it would appear to me that this Technological Development Committee must be a committee which has great importance.

KINNEY: It is. It's one of or the key committee. It is the key committee now because it has been merged or was merged some time ago with the Education Committee and therefore became the key committee in my opinion. Of course, you must never think that I am from time to time trying to downgrade any other committee. But as far as standing committees are concerned, I would suggest that that's the key committee. Except that you can't divorce the fact that probably the Finance Committee is also vying for that position because the organization just won't function without a good, solid Finance Committee.

INTERVIEWER: Well, when you say that. . .

KINNEY: They are two different types of committees with two different endeavors.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. When you say that the work of the Education Committee comes under the purview of the Technological Development. . .

KINNEY: They're one committee.

INTERVIEWER: They're one committee. You've already said something about how this committee defines its role, but what was the definition of the task before the committee?

KINNEY: To investigate and report to the Council Board on all new innovations, developments, within the sphere of our jurisdiction and to contact manufacturers of equipment and/or processes and/or chemicals to learn as quickly as possible anything that is in the research and development stage and go and see it, and, if possible, arrange a seminar with that company to sit and have them explain to us and to demonstrate to us anything that they had out from under wraps--in other words, that wasn't top secret with them. Many times we got to see some of those. And to report back on what effect it would have on our membership, on our trade, and what we should do, or offer our opinions on what it should do--what we should do--in the way of training or retraining of our people to accommodate them to being able to assimilate themselves to this new process as it entered the industry.

One continuing study there is the use of scanners, electronic scanners--how it affected our camera operators and dot etchers and so on. Another is any automated equipment such as the process with the consoles, automated plate-making equipment where they're programmed with a key punch tape or electronic tape, any processors or developers that might incline to reduce the skills of the people but require other technical knowledge or technology of our people to be able to retain the same type of a skilled position, yet operating under the terms of something that didn't require quite as much skill. To ensure that these were used as tools of our people rather than have the employers designate them as positions of a lower-rated job. And I would say that that was its function; it was its terms of reference and its function. Every trip was not as successful as its predecessor or necessarily as successful. What I'm trying to say is that some trips were more spectacularly successful in the amount of knowledge gained from that particular trip than some other one was, sometimes because what we were investigating turned out to be not as startling or not as. . .

INTERVIEWER: Innovative.

KINNEY: . . .innovative as what it had been projected to be, but we must search it out and be sure that that's so before we write it off.

INTERVIEWER: It sounds as if you've had pretty good cooperation by and large with the companies.

KINNEY: Very good, very good. This organization has always had a reasonably good relationship with most manufacturers. There's some that they did not have good relationships with. I think some of it was influenced by the fact that the Printing Industry of America had some influence over these companies not to cooperate for their own given reasons. That's an opinion; it's purely out in left field; it's not something that I have knowledge of or that I have information that would make me say that. It's just a . . . do you want to call it a feeling or . . . ?

INTERVIEWER: Where these innovations have resulted in lost jobs, has your committee been involved in coordinating negotiations and bargaining about how to protect jobs or to phase them out with attrition or whatever?

KINNEY: Well, let me say this: the whole organization is dovetailed to the degree that when a committee such as the Technological Committee reports, other committees take from that report what they need to make their committee function properly, not necessarily functioning only on the information they get from the Technological Developments Committee but taking from that committee's report the things that they would inject into their thinking. And one of them would be the Standard Form Language Committee. The Technological Developments Committee came up with the manning clauses that . . .

INTERVIEWER: With what clauses?

KINNEY: Manning.

INTERVIEWER: Manning, uh-hm.

KINNEY: Press manning. And they had them accepted by the International Committee. And then the Standard Form Language included that in their International Standard Form Language booklet or book. And these people that were responsible, those officers that were responsible for bargaining with PDI. . . don't ask me the full name of it. . . [Printing Developments Incorporated]

INTERVIEWER: (Laughing) I was just gonna say: what's PDI?

[Long Interruption]

KINNEY: I don't know anybody out here who can tell us.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

KINNEY: It's a division of Time-Life, and it operates in central locations, scanners for color separation as a large trade shop operation where any company in the nation can order color separations from their copy and have it delivered to them. And we have a national contract with that company. And if the Technological Developments Committee came up with any information that would lead these people to believe that they should have either protective language or have certain wage rates reflected for certain jobs so as to deter, ;if you will, the utilization or certain processes, then they would take that from the information gained from the Technological Developments Committee and use it in their planning for negotiations with companies such as PDI.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

INTERVIEWER: [Could I suggest] that we turn now to any discussion that you want to put on tape with respect to your role in the merger of the Lithographers and the Photoengravers?

KINNEY: Well, as a councillor I was, of course, debating and contributing toward this merger through our council discussions of every meeting that took place between the top officers of each organization. I was the council representative on two meetings, I believe. I couldn't tell you where. No, cut that down and call it one. . .

INTERVIEWER: Where was that meeting?

KINNEY: In Phoenix.

INTERVIEWER: O.K.

KINNEY: As a council representative on a merger meeting with the IPEU in Phoenix, Arizona.

INTERVIEWER: Now, you have said there was no IPEU in Vancouver, or did I misunderstand?

KINNEY: Oh, yes there was.

INTERVIEWER: There was? O.K.

KINNEY: That's as far as the international merger was concerned and thenceforth, of course, as all councillors were after the merger, I became a trustee or director, or whatever you want, of the IPEU Pension Plan, which took a lot of work, a lot of sweat, blood and tears.

INTERVIEWER: Now I notice that one of the considerations that the Lithographers had was that the Photo-engravers had an older membership and there was some discussion that this was going to drain the pension fund of the Lithographers.

KINNEY: Yeah. Well, of course, they weren't coming into our pension. The biggest problem was they had a pension that was not in very good shape. They had, I guess the expression is, "thought with their heart instead of their head" when they brought it into force in whatever year it was, '59, I think it was. And it wasn't actuarially sound. It wasn't broke, but it wasn't actuarially sound. And they couldn't meet their future commitments and responsibilities on the basis on which it was founded. And it was up to the Council Board, or the officers and the Council Board to develop some means of putting them back on an actuarially sound basis and it resulted in some substantial discussion and differences of opinion between those who are Photoengravers and those who are. . .

INTERVIEWER: Because suddenly Photoengravers had to pay a much higher premium?

KINNEY: No, it didn't change the premium too much but it reduced the benefit.

INTERVIEWER: I see.

KINNEY: And reducing the benefit, because they had a higher membership and there was more exposure to the paying of the benefit to the percentage of people. . .

INTERVIEWER: They had a higher membership, you mean an older membership?

KINNEY: Higher age membership, yeah. Their age was higher. Their average age was ten years older than ours, I think. Because their exposure to payment of those benefits was much greater than the finances that they had to lean on.

INTERVIEWER: This leads me to a sort of subsidiary question. In the LPIU, were retired members members? Were they considered members in good standing or did they have to be actively employed?

KINNEY: To be counted on the membership list?

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

KINNEY: I can't answer that with a direct yes or not. Because in the LPIU we have exempt members. Once you reach 60 years of age and have been 20 years in the trade as a member, a paid-up member, reach 60 years of age and retire from the trade, you become a exempt member which means your mortuary policy will be paid on your death with no further payments into the organization. And I would have to check with Don Stone to be sure as to whether they were counted in our overall membership when we said we had-- say we said we had 35,000 members--well, I can't be sure they were not counted. Anybody who retired otherwise, they were not a member unless they continued to pay their dues until they either (1) reached 60 years of age or (2) had been 20 years in the trade and had reached 60 years of age. So, I'm making the definition between the fact that the Photoengravers include their retired members on their active rosters as far as how many members they have at all times. I can't tell you whether the reverse was true with the Lithographers, but we were never prone to try to expand our membership by use of figures such as that, to my knowledge. Now mind you I'm not running the organization down here, or wasn't running it, so I can't really say, but the . . .

INTERVIEWER: How large and active a local was the Photoengravers' local in. . .

KINNEY: In Vancouver?

INTERVIEWER: Vancouver.

KINNEY: Well, following the merger of International we moved very quickly to merge in Vancouver, because you can see our number is local 210. We were the tenth local that merged. And there was a rash of them all at one time. During that period of time I was a special representative for the International in Alberta and I was instrumental, along with others, in having the Calgary Local and the Edmonton local merge, and the numbers just got juggled in there--I think the numbers were something like 208--I don't know what Calgary is, but something in there, then 210 and 211. And I represented the International on the basis of one week a month, or one week in five or something like that in Alberta for about three years, just servicing the locals and doing some organizing down in there. Just on a loan basis from my local for that period of time.

INTERVIEWER: Calgary is 206.

KINNEY: Yeah, 206. Then 210 and 211. You can see how fast numbers were being issued, you see.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

KINNEY: And all those mergers took place within a month, I think. And in Vancouver there were 48 Photo-engravers, including the retired. (Laughter) And that included seven working in the newspaper, a very small photoengraving department, and the balance of them working in five commercial shops. So you can see there was no large one.

INTERVIEWER: Uh-hm.

KINNEY: And since that time one of those five commercial shops has closed up. It went bankrupt a couple years ago. A newspaper has gone into cold type and expanded substantially, and we now have twenty members in the newspaper and the balance in the four commercial houses, which puts about 28 in the commercial houses and I guess we've expanded in the photoengraving by about two or three members in that five-year period.

INTERVIEWER: What do you mean by cold type?

KINNEY: Cold type composition--in the composing room, which means, as far as the engraving department is concerned, that would expand the engraving department, because under the cold type system they produce type by the photographic method and then paste it up in page form and send the page to the photoengravers, who make a photoengraving of every full page, whereas previously they only made the half-tones of editorial matter. The advertising used to be all done in the commercial shops and sent in. Now it's done in the shop in the plant and so it's expanded to twenty members in the plant because of the cold type process.

And the Photoengraving division--branch--whatever you will, of our local has not expanded beyond what I said, two or three people, bodies, members. There is really nothing on the horizon that would lead me to believe that they will. I would believe also that they will remain reasonably static at that number for some time because the newspaper will expand and as they expand maybe another half-dozen people, the commercial shops will decline, remaining reasonably constant. Maybe two or three people one way or the other. Unless there's some innovation that comes in that requires photoengraving. But it doesn't appear on the horizon right now.

(Tape interruptions and then continuing)

KINNEY: At the present time our local is actually 750 people. Our offices are in our own building. We own our own building.

INTERVIEWER: You mean that includes the Bookbinders or exclusive of the Bookbinders.

KINNEY: Exclusive. We're not merged with them yet.

INTERVIEWER: Yes. Ok.

KINNEY: We have our own building which we built. Five years ago this August we moved in, so that five years ago now we were building it. We own that building between ourselves and the mortgage company, with the mortgage company having the edge. (Laughter) And it's completely leased to trade unions; the space is completely leased to trade unions with the exception of our school. We have our own school in the building. One of those tenants are the Bookbinders and have been ever since the building was built.

INTERVIEWER: Do you have any other graphic arts in the building?

KINNEY: No. No. We've always been fighting the other graphic arts, so there's not much chance we're going to get them in our building. But the IBEW is in there, the Central Labor Council offices are there, the Vancouver Labor Council, the Sheetmetal Workers are in there, the Electrical Apprentice Division, which is a separate thing between the employers and the union; they have offices in there; the Bookbinders, our school and ourselves--about 12,000 square feet. As recently as last September we purchased the property next to us, which was a house, and had it torn down and the lot has been leveled and we're going to put it into parking and hold it either for expansion or investment--for future use is a better way of putting it.

INTERVIEWER: Well, how do you feel about this whole question of merger that is so much in the air, especially in view of your comments about your individual situation in. . .

KINNEY: Well, I have been a complete supporter of all mergers in the graphic arts, regardless of any feelings I may have towards any other unions, about their philosophies, their constitutions and by-laws, and what have you. I think that merger is the salvation of the union control of the graphic arts industry. And I think that mergers must proceed as rapidly as possible providing (this is where I get a little parochial, I suppose) providing none of our philosophies and traditional practices become submerged by such a merger. I think that at the present moment, no matter how things are going jurisdictionally because of the heat that we have created through the two quick mergers, that we're going to have to step up our approach to mergers with at least one, if not both, of the other two major graphic arts craft unions.

INTERVIEWER: This would be the Pressmen and . . .?

KINNEY: Pressmen and ITU. I feel that the ITU is still a long distance before they are going to see the necessity or can bring themselves to an organic merger in another graphic arts union unless they control, which they are trying to do, or propose I believe, to the Pressmen at the present time, or have been over a period. And because of the structure of the IPP & AU, I believe that we must move very quickly to salvage our position with them. Because of the political atmosphere within the IPP & AU at this particular time, that organization, in my opinion, is liable to splinter very shortly, which may or may not be an advantage in any approach we may have toward merger with them. But either before or at the time of that splintering, we must be on the scene, actively pursuing merger with either the craft segment of the IPP & AU, or the whole of the IPP & AU, whichever becomes available to us at that time. I feel very strongly about this. I think that we probably, in our activities in consumating merger with the Bookbinders, either had not enough time to devote or overlooked the opportunity to have a merger with the Stereotypers Union. I think that, at this present moment, in my opinion, [The Stereotypers Union] is headed in another direction.

INTERVIEWER: You mean you think they are going to merge elsewhere?

KINNEY: With the IPP & AU. And the ballots are out, you know. They failed to get a ballot to merge with us, but they've now got a ballot out to merge with the IPP & AU, and if they do it's going to weaken our position with the newspapers as you can imagine--20 people out of some 1,000 or 1,100 people at Pacific Press in Vancouver--20 people.

INTERVIEWER: On the other hand, I understand that the Guild itself is looking for places to merge.

KINNEY: Do you belong to the Guild?

INTERVIEWER: No.

KINNEY: I'm just checking to find out what I can say.
(Laughter)

INTERVIEWER: Just to the teachers union!! (Laughter)

KINNEY: That won't go on the record, will it. You better forget it. We'll let the powers that be think that one out. I've had a reasonable amount of dealing with the Guild. I probably better not comment.

INDEX

Earl Kinney

Alberta, Canada
Amalgamated Lithographers of
America (ALA)
American Federation of Labor (AFL)

Boston, Massachusetts
Brown, Kenneth

Calgary, Alberta
Canadian Labor Congress
Central Labor Council
Chicago, Illinois
Communist Party
Congress of Industrial Organization
(CIO)
Council Board

Dallas, Texas

Edmonton, Alberta
Education Committee
Electrical Apprentice Division
Evergreen Press

Fair & Equal Employment Act
Finance Committee

Graphic Arts International Union

Hutcheson, William

International Brotherhood of
Bookbinders (IB&B)
International Brotherhood of
Electrical Workers (IBEW)
International Photoengravers Union
IPEU Pension Plan
International Printing Pressmen &
Assistants Union (IPP&AU)
International Typographical Union
(ITU)
International Woodworkers of America

Labor Act of British Columbia
Lithographers & Photoengravers
International Union (LPIU)

Miami, Florida
Mitchell Press
Montreal, Quebec
Mont Tremblant

Newfoundland, Canada
Newspaper Guild
New York, New York
Nova Scotia, Canada

Ottawa, Ontario

Pacific Press
Phoenix, Arizona
Printing Developments Incorporated
Printing Industry of America

Robinson, Ben

St. Louis, Missouri
Sheetmetal Workers Union
Slater, Patrick
Standard Form Language Committee
Stereotypers Union
Stone, Don
Sun Publishing Company

Technological Development Committee
Time-Life
Toronto, Ontario
Trades & Labor Congress

United Steelworkers of America

VanArkle, Mr.
Vancouver, British Columbia

Vancouver Labor Council

Wallace, Jack