

ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

with

Albert E. Perry
Local 32J
New York

August 1, 1977

by

Pat Thomas

for

The Oral History Program
Service Employees International Union

- 23.1

QUESTION: Would you give me your name, your local union and the positions you've held in the union.

ANSWER: My name is Albert E. Perry, commonly known as Al. I am the President Emeritus of Local 32J, now engaged in research and study for crime and implementing programs, street crimes against members of Local 32J who are on their way home from work. I started in 32J in 1938, having been in Local 32B since March 1934.

QUESTION: Could you tell me how you got involved initially in union activity?

ANSWER: Well, in union activity - I assume I've been in union activity since I was probably 11½ years of age when I first had a job in the railroad and I learned something about unions in the railroad.

I was there for about a year and a half and then I left there and I - after I finished my education - my education was such that I was able to read when I was three years of age and so I was much advanced in that part, or elementary education, than were most people. Then I went to sea when I was fourteen, right after the war, and there I learned something about the Seamen's union and then I came to New York and I went, after intermittent trips to sea, into the construction work and there again, I held offices in some of the construction workers' unions. After the - I was also a member of the IWW on the West Coast, in the loggers union. Then living near the Centralia, Washington, where the massacre took place in 1919 and in that area of course, I was only maybe twenty miles away from Centralia at that time. Then during the subsequent months people took up sides and they became very heated as to the whole situation and therefore I learned something about that. I also worked in the mines in Butte for period of time and my education there was in talking to the miners' teenage children because most of the miners were first generation immigrants and at that time of course there was-the strike for the one big union had been lost. But getting back to my entrance into the Service Employees, during the Depression,

after 1931, work in the building trades and I tried to work at various types of jobs, selling, I learned to sell in those days a little bit here and there, selling novelties, putting packages together - not making much money but interesting enough. Also I decided after I learned a little bit in selling, I decided to step up a little bit and I applied for a job in the Union Labor Life Insurance Company. This was in the latter part of 1933. I was familiar with the Union Labor Life Insurance Company because at the very beginning, when they were putting the company together, I knew about the attempt to sell insurance to union members and the insurance would be strictly for the benefit of union members because of other insurance companies taking advantage of the workers on the industrial type of insurance, which was five cents a week, ten cents a week, was all. So I became affiliated, as a representative, not doing much of a job because there wasn't much insurance to sell, but at that particular point, around the beginning of January of 1934 there was a feud going on between Matt Wall and a Father ^{Coughlin} Cognell(?) from Detroit who was known at that time as The Radio Priest. He accused in part, labor, for not doing the job, particularly the American Federation of Labor, that was just

keeping organizing the crafts rather than organizing the industrial - industrial plant unions to the extent that one day - he called - one Sunday - he called the American Federation of Labor racketeers. A quote made by him which I think after, to some extent, hurt him. But nevertheless, Matt Wall, who was the vice president of the American Federation of Labor, had gone on the radio at a rally, trying to explain their side of the argument, the controversy. Then the next day after that I happened to meet Matt Wall. We were at 1440 Broadway, which was - it was a fairly large building, it had four or five elevator banks manually operated and I think we were on the ninth or tenth floor so that I met him in front of the elevator bank and I said it looks like the good Father really wanted to take you over yesterday - after saying good morning of course - and he said, ah, he doesn't know what he's talking about. He said you know, Perry, we're looking for craft people, fellows like you who have skills and therefore, he said, we want to protect them and their interests. He said these other people, they can't be organized. So I said well, I disagree with you. Because I think these unskilled people should be organized because they have nothing to sell but the ⁱⁿ labor. At least if I have a job I can

sell my skills to some degree. Sure I'm better off if I am organized and I have a better chance of selling - getting a higher price for my skills but the nonskilled person has nothing. And therefore he must be organized in order to band together to put a price tag on his labor. So he looked at me and he said, Look, he said if you think that way, you don't belong in this company, you're - a man by the name of James J. Bambrick is preaching the same brand as you just said just now. Do you know him? I said no, but I said I'd - I said where - He said he's trying to get a charter and he's trying to organize service employees. And at that time I said, what do you mean, service employees. And he said, well these fellows - these elevator operators. These people here - he said, do you think that they could be organized? I said, sure, why not? They're unskilled but they've^{got}/to - they're in a key position. Why shouldn't they - need organization probably worse than.... He said I think you better go see Bambrick. I said where is he? So he said he's just across town at 122 E. 42nd Street. And I said - I can remember somebody by that name on the union label campaign some years ago when they was trying to organize the cigarette companies. Is that the same fellow? And he said that's him. So I went

immediately from there to the Building
on 120 E. 42nd Street in New York City and I
found Bambrick's office, which was about ten by
twelve, an office which had no windows and completely
enclosed. And the interior - he incidentally had
got this office to some degree from a firm by the
name of Rice and McGuire - Eddie McGuire, who be-
came very prominent in the service union a little
later and in construction - representing construc-
tion workers in a number of areas and the central
labor trades and state federation of labor. How-
ever, in meeting Bambrick I my
discussion I found it wasn't really much of an
organization that he had and to crystallize it to
some degree, he told me how he had started and he
was looking to get a charter, but he had - apparently
there was a superintendents organization by the name
of the number 32 affiliated with the Building Service
Employees International Union and these superintendents
were mostly in apartment houses but they had this
local number 32. It was headed up by a man by the
name of Paul Bell. They used to call him the Old
War Horse. He was interested in organizing the
service help such as the elevator operators, the
hall men, the porters, etc. in the apartment houses
as well as the people in the office and loft buildings.

And that he - that Bambrick had been at an affair that they had called together and they had got the glee club - Bambrick was a member of the Big Six - and he was singing in the glee club and they had some problems over who had joined the glee club and after it was over they got together and they started to discuss organization. In respect to the fact that we had section 7(a) of the NRA at that time and we had the Blue Eagle and the code and so on, but it gave the unions the legal right to organize and bargain collectively with representatives of our own choosing. And this is what James J. Bambrick was promoting. Bambrick was a terrific orator. He was a great writer and a great publicist, etc. They had no money and it was not easy to move the workers and his theory was that we would concentrate to some degree on the garment center buildings, the loft - what we called loft buildings in those days. And that he - in the meantime, we would also try the apartment houses. There wasn't much of a crew. The crew was about six people and there are none of them around now and we worked strictly on a commission basis. At that time the initiation fee was a dollar and the dues were a dollar. We got sixty cents from the dollar and we got ten cents from the second month's

dues. And of course if you were fortunate enough in getting a lot of members you were able to get along. But actually, it didn't/^{move}that fast. But it's like planting seed, laying ground work, etc. And as we progressed we realized that we had a tremendous amount of opposition - not only from the workers themselves but they had - one organization was Communist dominated. The Service Employees had another local (of?) elevator operators which was very dormant and then there was an independent organization that was headed up by Arthur Harckham and . They were mostly the garment workers but they had really no members. At one time they had a membership, they had a few strikes - independent strikes - which they lost. But they also had it through the whole industry that the AFL was discriminating against unskilled workers, they were no good and they particularly discriminated against black people. And of course if you read the - some of the convention records from way back you will see that - in some of Phil Randolph's statements, they certainly did discriminate against black people. As a matter of fact, on the convention floor the name nigger was commonly used. You could probably see it in the archives. Well we had to overcome those. We had to overcome the prejudice of discrimination.

And we had to overcome the prejudice against the AFL-CIO which of course was quite a putdown by Father Coughlin of which I recently heretofore mentioned. But then we had some areas of

of setting up an organization where we had no charter. We were trying to get a charter through the AFL-CIO or a charter from the Building Service Employees International Union. And at that time, for some reason, Jerry Horan who was president would not issue a separate charter because he felt that - or perhaps the other local, which was 66 - no it was not 66, 66 was the cargo - the local of elevator operators which was completely dormant was objecting to it and perhaps the Superintendents Local 32 was objecting. So we then formed a committee calling it Local 32B. Now that was the initial - that's how the initial 32B came about. There was a Local 32, then we said 32B, we didn't want to take the letter A and supersede it so we named it 32B. That's what the committee agreed upon by the officers, Paul Bell and others, at that time, Bambrick, our committee. But later on they did send a charter to - Local 32 Helpers and - Building Helpers - and then of course later on they decided to make the charter Local 32B, Building Service Employees International, as it now stands today.

There were some internal disputes in respect to this but then later on in the - that year of 1934, we were preparing to probably have a strike with the aid of the garment workers. But during the summer of that time - get a little ahead of my story - a strike at 501 7th Avenue was in progress and Tom Young, who was vice president of 32B, headed up that strike. They were losing the strike and let me say at that time this was a preliminary thing with the organizing committee but we had in our minds to set up officers of the union so they would have various types of positions and so the strike was a losing thing and I had approached Tom Young with respect to well, why don't you come with us, maybe we can get the support of the AFL. He was quite reluctant and then he finally said, if you can guarantee me that they will support us in this strike then I'll think about it. I went back to Bambrick. Bambrick and I went to see him again and we the same thing. Bambrick got a hold of Marty Lacey, who was head of one of the Teamsters Unions and his union had the garment truckers. Because Young had explained, well if the truckers, truck drivers didn't move any of the material then that would help them win the strike. So we must remember, all these people were on strike but the

elevators were operated by scabs, both the front and back. To get people to replace strikers was very easy. There was a lot of unemployment and aside from that, there was opposition to the union and then the employers hired all kinds of goons and would-be tough guys in order to protect their turf, their so-called turf. (Whatever they called them?) they protected safety and property. So in the discussion with Tom Young, now Marty Lacey was a very salty sort of individual but a good Teamster and he said to Tom Young, now look, you join the union, I'm going to stop my truckers. You're going to join the union, you're going to stay in there. But if you ever - I mean here we're talking about the AFL discriminating against blacks or people of that sort - we're not going to support them. So Tom - also in discussing with Bambrick and I have pretty much of a - because I had a trade union background, and only two other persons that were on this crew had a trade union background, (it was discussed?) well maybe if we have a black officer it will take away some of the heat as to the discrimination. So I said to Bambrick, well why don't we make him a vice president when we set up our office? That's how he got the commitment to become the vice president and also the fact was the support

of Lacey who immediately stopped the trucks and this is how the strike was won. And that gave us a good mood further because all of the publicity, the strike, the moving over into the AFL-CIO. The same thing applied to Young, who became quite active amongst the - particularly the black persons working in the garment area. Then later on, we developed to the point where we were getting a little stale because people would join the union at the beginning, like the people I put in the union in March - we're beginning now - I'm talking about in the area of August, about this time of year - and they were not - saying well we need action, what's taking place, we're paying dues, etc. So it became inevitable, eventually we would have to have some concerted action. So then we had discussions with Arthur Harckham. You know, since Young had moved over, then while they had members, some members, but they were not paying dues. They had no money because the same as ours, they were members but they didn't pay dues and so we had nothing and they were also keeping people out. So then it was suggested and I sugg... - because I was supposed to become - once I was supposed to be the vice president although I was very altruistic

so I didn't even - wasn't thinking in terms of office. I guess this was because of my training amongst the and so on that the worker comes first. So then when we gave Tom the vice presidency, Bambrick said all right, you can be the recording secretary. Because we had another man who was quite active with a trade union background who was working to be the secretary-treasurer. But this is just sort of politics, planning ahead for control and administrative purposes and so on. Well then when getting to Arthur I said look, maybe you ought to put him as the recording secretary. Give him that position and if we break that jam at least we can know we can solidify the garment area. So on that basis he agreed. He came to our meeting and he said he was moving over and we had the meeting in the Labor Temple up on 84th Street and now we began to have a bigger and bigger basis of organization. So that we had threats of strike. Actually, wages were terrible, hours were long, all conditions were.... But some of the people still were reluctant to join unions. The garment workers, the heads of the joint board of the garment workers, Charlie Simmons(?), Mary Groves⁷, and three or four people

whose names I don't recall at this point, who have now passed on, they would support us. Sidney Hillman and - so - and Pitaski(?) - so that the day was scheduled for the strike - very quiet - but not the particular time. So it was in March. I think March 4th, something like that. Not March, but November 4th, around that period of time that....

QUESTION: What year was that?

ANSWER: 1934. And that's when we had the big garment strike. At that time the mayor of New York City was LaGuardia and he was in favor of the unions. He was very labor minded and particularly realized the conditions that people worked under. So then - the strike was quite hectic because they were preparing all the time, they were preparing to have strike breakers. As we were carrying on this war of nerves they were recruiting strike breakers and as a matter of fact, in one building they had begun to build up a large group of strike breakers. They lived in these big open lofts and they were fed and slept there and were ready for action - about five or six floors. Well we were aware of what was taking place and so one of the things we had to be sure of, because they felt if

we go on strike then they'll have this whole group for immediate replacements and probably some - well I guess they probably had in that - in housing - that group, they had four, five, six hundred of them at that building but they had other areas around whereby they had other smaller groups and these fellows all had friends that they were ready to call too. So that they were prepared to man the whole.... Now one of the things that - part of the strategy was that these people had to be dismantled (sic), they had to be stampeded, they had to be, in a sense, get out of there before - when the strike would take place so that we would have at least a jump on them and so we had to disorganize. And of course I happened to be one of the guys who was slated, because I was a young, strong guy, to be in charge of that dismantlement and disruption of their organization, which was taken care of so that in the first part of the strike they were all so disorganized and frightened to some degree, that they didn't know what to do. Fortunately for us, the police department was more or less in sympathy with the workers rather than this group of goons because they realized that these were - probably be potential cop killers anyhow. So they

weren't so happy about that group. But then the strike progressed, we had flying squads. Again I was in charge of all the squads per se. I had to take one squad one day for a couple of hours and one the next and so on. And we had the people go - we had headquarters set up - and so we pushed all the people down into these areas. And of course there was a lot of argument about kidnapping, violating federal laws and all the things that went with it. It was quite hectic, there's no question about it. But eventually we signed up thousands and thousands of people. When we went down to the hall the signing just caught fire so that by the time the four days of strike - let's say three and a half days because they were working (back and forth?), they finally agreed to arbitrate. Some of the employers were willing - some around the the date were willing to arbitrate, they were looking standard - all of them weren't that bad - but there were others who were pretty hidebound and hardnosed and adamant in respect to not having any union. However, a man was chosen to arbitrate by the name of Jeremiah T. Mahoney, who was a leader of the silk stocking district but who had been a former judge and a judge later on, a judge of the Supreme

Court. But then of course there was a truce and the workers went back to work and the arbitration took place and I recite this question of arbitration because it still sticks with us in some part today. It's still somewhat of a sticker. The employers had a gripe. In some of the smaller buildings they had hardships because of the lack of rental space they didn't have the income to offset the cost factor and therefore they wanted to divide it into classes. And eventually this took place. They were classified in the lofts first - Class A, Class B and Class C. It was Jeremiah T. Mahoney who made that and of course they got a union agreement and it was, matter of fact, a union shop. In this of course I can't leave aside the aid of the garment workers per se because they themselves were the strike breakers, that is, the workers and the leaders didn't operate any great number of places, any of the textile machines or sewing machines or anything that pertained to a garment activity or activity. Then, as a matter of fact I have a letter here of 1935 where I sent - Jeremiah T. Mahoney and he's thanking me for my - congratulate him - that's a document at least to back up some of the things I say.

QUESTION: That's dated October 1, 1935 and it's from....

ANSWER: This was in 1934. He became the arbitrator and this went on for quite awhile (end side 1)

23.2

QUESTION: You were talking about the arbitration.

ANSWER: The arbitration award came down, as I said, in Class A, Class B, and Class C. And actually, the way it was set up was that anything that was less than 120,000 square feet was a Class C and between 120,000 sq. ft. - this is gross(?) - to 220, I'm not just sure of that figure, 240,000, was a Class B and anything above 240,000 sq. ft. was a Class A. Now these figures seem very low compared to how the buildings are built today but that was the structure and a lot more buildings were in Class C category than were - or at least the majority probably was in the B - but there were almost as many Cs as there were Bs and the As were very few. Now of course the union was not - one thing they could say - the union was really not equipped to - even though they tried to hire expert help - to determine all these things because the employer was reluctant to show all their books and records and so on. But the arbitrator was able to get enough things that he felt the best basis because certainly everybody got a considerable raise and there was a standardization of hours, which became the forty-eight hour week

in the garment area and the standard wage scale for these various lofts, various classifications of buildings - now I didn't look into the archives to see what the wage scales were. I guess it would have been very interesting to take a look at because I know some wages were as low as - in one case the standard wage was fourteen cents an hour and there was an average bouncing around of about twenty-three cents an hour. So that they came up I think to roughly around forty cents an hour. But/^{the}history will show those things. I'm sorry I didn't think about that when I came to you. But there's, no doubt there are contracts around that show . Well, now this - while I'm on this point, this question of classifications stuck a great deal to us and caused a great deal of trouble at a later date. But I'll stop for a moment because during this time, in February of that year, I had some problems in Harlem where I was shot, stabbed and hospitalized for about five weeks, and some other people, and it was a very incidental thing that took place. At that time of course Bambrick as I said, was a good publicity man. He was organizing the whole city and he had every faction of the city covered. At that time, in the

tremendous mass meetings he would hold, he was a great orator, people liked to listen to him. He could talk for an hour and fifteen minutes and people would listen. He was a great educator as far as the labor organization was concerned. This night in February, February 15, 1935, we had a meeting with no one who was at the Star Casino which one of the biggest halls in New York City at that time, even somewhat larger than the Garden, Madison Square Garden at that time, which held some 12,000 people. They had this meeting there and of course the place was jammed. There were still a lot of problems developing within the organization because it seemed we had people who, after they got organized, they became very bold and they demanded other things. So - perhaps, they were fed by the various detective agencies to create rows and probably all felt we were infiltrated by Pinkertons and Burns, who created some situations and so on.. But anyway, at this point we had a fellow by the name of McLeod, Clint(?) McLeod, a black man, who was organizing Harlem and prior to this I used to go to Harlem and speak. I learned something about public speaking at that time because I'd go over there and I'd make a factual speech and -

a good radical speech but it wouldn't seem to have too much effect but Clint was pretty much an
and he'd turn hand springs and pull
the elevator dumbwaiter I'd be talking
and people might be falling asleep. Well he'd wake them up. But nevertheless he was probably an operator, which we didn't know it. Anyway, he came that night to the meeting - February, I'm speaking about - he asked that some of the white fellows go up and support the black people in Harlem to show that there was unity between the two. And one of our fellows was a sort of a head man, Dave Ritchey, who was a general organizer. And I may say we were beginning to break the city up into councils, in geographical jurisdictions so that we had set up about seven or eight councils. Except in the Harlem area we later on had a local which was disbanded, and I'll come to that question later, but - so Ritchey suggested that I and two other fellows go down to the Apartments which was 119th Street and Lenox, and look at the situation there because he had taken a survey as to strike breakers, etc. And so we did and I was in charge and went there and at first didn't see any police. Usually where there's picketing there's police. I talked to the pickets and they said they

were strike breakers and so we decided to go in - and this was in an apartment, you went in one entrance but they had four entrances inside, a big open quad... and so we decided to go in to the left because they said over on the right there are some strike breakers - in the office but there were no lights in there so - it was now about 11:30 on the 16th - 12:30 - so what happened was that we go to the first elevator and when we saw the fellow there, who was running the elevator, and he was half asleep so we said what are you doing here breaking the strike? So we just took him outside. Now we didn't manhandle him or anything but he started to yell so we told him to shut up. In the meantime, somebody came out of the other side and said let go of that man, I've got a gun I'll shoot the belly off and he no sooner said that he started to shoot. So we said let's go this way, because now we could see the people in between us and the gate. And the other two fellows had went on ahead of us, had ran out before us. So now we laid there and we had to - but there was a crowd beginning to gather - where the hell they all came - I guess they was yelling "hold up", this, that, and so on. We were white-faced, and everyone was black. But we

we laid down there and the guy with the gun, we could just barely see him - so while they're coming around - so when he gets close to him, he passes him where he can get hold of him. But instead of that he knew where we was so he started to shoot, said get out, and we had to make a break for the door and I was crouched over so I got shot here - but anyway, we ran to, but we had to go through a wall of people so they beat and cut the living hell out of us. And if it wasn't for the police, truly, if the police didn't come we would've been finished. Anyway, the other boy, Joe Turner was shot - but he was shot by a city policeman because he was a tall fellow, about six eleven and the police officer was about six foot seven so what had happned, there was some guy there with a baseball bat and Joe had taken the bat away from him and they all ran. Of course when they saw cops, everybody disappeared. And all I remember is being thrown up against the gate but the police officer - I had a derby, in those days I wore a derby - and someone had knocked the derby over my eyes and so I couldn't see the uniform. I didn't even know I was shot until about minutes afterwards. There was blood running all places but I guess I thought it was

more or less from punches and things. But anyway, nevertheless, that was one of the occasions which then received a great deal of publicity and stimulated the organization a great deal more. But we recovered and we're still here. Now, since we had the (contract with the garment?), we began to spread and make great inroads - I think we probably, from let's say from November, the time of the strike til April of 1935 we probably organized over 25,000 members. So then later on in the year, in September, we had the regular elections. At that point Bambrick was some of the areas which - internal disputes and things began to gather because where ever there's power, there's --

there's the people who didn't do anything, they're looking into getting power. But anyway, then each district was called a council at that time. There were six but they were set up in various geographical jurisdictions. I don't think it's necessary for me to explain what they are here. But anyhow, then we began to get some flack from the International. Because prior to that - and this is part of the history that you're looking for, aside from the workers' struggle and so on, then there's the political struggle within

the organization. Now, when we first started, the International had an International vice president by the name of Paul Kraft. Well I guess the International didn't have too much money and the president of the International was Jerry Horan, the secondary treasurer was Paul Biggs....

QUESTION: In Chicago?

ANSWER: Yes. All in Chicago, headquarters of the Building Service Employees International Union was in Chicago. And I think Chicago was the heart of the organization at that time, the heart of the building services because they were fairly well organized and the flat janitors had perhaps one of the strongest unions maybe it still is today. But then we - out of somewhere, Paul Kraft went out and a fellow named George Scalese came in as International - first I think he was International representative and then Paul Kraft (disappeared?) as an International Vice President and Scalese became International Vice President. Probably the fifth Vice President. Then little by little you could see as we organized - we had a big strike in 1936 in the apartment house areas - citywide strike. We were out maybe fifteen,

twenty days - quite a strike and there are many stories and side issues we could talk about but we (won't?) talk about them here I guess. Then when the strike was settled we had some problems because one of the terms of the contract was that the employers would begin immediately to restore the employees to their former positions. But an employer may refuse employment to some one who had committed an act of violence or where he has employed someone on a steady basis, a permanent basis, he could retain that person. And this was a bad clause and it created great lockouts. But nevertheless the organization had got increases in the apartment houses and got a change in the wage structure. At that time in the apartment houses some of the people were working as low as \$45.00 a month and they had two shifts, one was the - in the seven days - six days a fourteen hour shift and the other was a ten hour shift. That's 84 hours a week for a six day week and then the other would be a sixty hour week for the other group. And then they swung over once every two weeks there was a twenty-four hour swingover. And the conditions were bad - no vacation, no holidays, no nothing - paid once a month I think, at that point. And then we

got them paid every ten days later on. But it was an improvement in the agreement. But then we began to see signs of certain things taking place. Now I, on a personal basis began to observe them. Some of the people that I had even put into the union - there are not too many of them around today - they began to form a combination from the Scalese area and what really took place, as the courts brought out, was that this same formula - now any apartment house which I - and in the office buildings, that formula stood very much the same that was in the lofts, they took it in the commercial office buildings - that Class A, Class B, Class C, and so there was about a \$2.00 a week - in these classifications - \$2.00 a week difference in wages. In other words, from a Class A to a B, there would be - the Bs would get \$2.00 less and the Cs would get \$2.00 less. And it's still like that today, a little - maybe a few cents one way or the other but that's the way it stands. Only today, the As -

in all the other areas, have outgrown out of the formula because the As in the office buildings today - the office buildings are pretty near all As. In those days there weren't that many. And the formula was applied to the residential - it was

really a rough thing because they took - and it still is - the total value then the excess valuation of the land and property and divide it by the total number of rooms and if it came out less than \$2,000 a room it was Class C. If it was between \$4,000 it was a B. And if it was over \$4,000 it was an A. No, I think it's four - two, four, six - that'd be \$6,000 for an A category. So that there was at one time in my own figures in creating some opposition to this formula, was that there was only thirty-three Class A apartment houses under the whole group. But what began to happen was that certain people would approach guys in charge of, not only areas, but also the persons who became involved, who set up what the value of the classification of the building was. If there was an architect hired, there was rules and so on but there was some stretching in a sense here and there. And so it would appear that this \$2.00 a week meant an awful lot to an employer and you could probably see it if you had say 25 employees. In those days, particularly in apartment houses, in other words, they had more employees per group. In apartment houses they had a hall man and,

besides elevator people and back elevator people and so on, which all are dispensed with today. But they would take out a situation something like this - the landlords had did (sic) it before in their competition with each other. It wasn't something that was new. The managing agent would go to a landlord and say well I can do the work for \$3,000 and save you \$3,000 a year. Now we're talking quite a few years back, over forty some odd years. So that on those basis, \$3,000 was probably equivalent to say \$15,000 or maybe \$20,000 today, perhaps. I guess \$20,000 would be about the same ratio. So what would take place - this was before the union - they would just cut the wages. When the competition/^{was}between the management agents and landlords. Now we get back to when the union standards were set up, the only way was to see if they got a lower classification. So it appears from the top sprang a group of people who were suggesting to the field men and so on to change classifications. They would go to the landlord - they would approach the landlord and they would say, well we can change the classification and save you \$30,000 a year - or \$3,000 a year - or whatever the ratio came -

but we need the first year payment, whatever the formula was.

QUESTION: So they'd ask for some money.

ANSWER: Oh yes. And then they would probably go back to the field representative or the guy who could swing this (or that?) live under it and they would try to work something out. This was getting pretty rough. There had been a lot of complaints by employers as well as like field people and members now because these things were beginning to creep in. Now unfortunately, with Bambrick, who was a power man in organization, he had a fear of the racketeers. You must remember, in those days there was a difference in ages between myself and Bambrick - seventeen years - and so I being younger, probably never looked at the situation the way he did. There was a whole history of Murder, Inc., Lepke? and Girare(?) and a whole bunch of people
 so there was no question about this pressure and this question of threats of death and so on. Oh, I had them too but they didn't seem like to me that that meant anything. It was just somebody trying to see if they could shake you up a little bit. But he used to get shook up and on this

basis he probably had - we used to argue about Scalese because of the areas of what they call racketeering and he said well, it's the politics and back doors and so on and so on. It seemed to work all right at the beginning. But the one day - this is rather an odd thing - but one day in 1937, when we began to see - I'm not quite sure whether it was in '37 or '36, but I'm sure it's '37 - we had - now the way the structure of 32B was at that time, the chairman and secretary of the council were members of the Executive Board. So as I say, we had about seventy councils and we had fourteen people on the Executive Board plus the four top offices. Now the chairman and the secretary of the councils, they were worked. I was chairman of Council 5. Because after we got through with the garment work area I went into the apartment house sector. So then we had the Executive Board because we were field people too. We began to make inquiries and started to complain. We began to realize that part of the problem was coming from the International representative who had set himself up pretty well and so on and so we decided, on a motion of the Executive Board, that we would not have any more dealings with the International

representative and we would ask for his removal and we would ask for - disconnect all the phones and he or none of his aides would be allowed into the offices of 32B which, incidentally, at that time were 570 7th Avenue. I spoke at the beginning about the small little office in the Well then we moved to 42nd Street and 9th Avenue, right across from the Holland Hotel which now is the Post Office. It was a loft building. And there we got various(?) space. It was almost empty; space was cheap and many of the mechanics like Dave Ritchey and Steve Thornton and a number of people and ourselves, we set up these offices. We built them ourselves, got furniture from different places which would have been thrown out. We solicited stuff that had been stashed away and that's how we set up the office and furnished the office. And then we used, after that, when the strike - going back to 1934 - we used the Holland Hotel which was over there, for our strike headquarters. And when we started that strike - actually I don't think the treasury was more than \$250. (That) gives Bambrick a lot of credit, a lot of nerve. So he said - well we discussed this. Well we have to do it now, it's do or die, so to speak. And so he moved into the headquarters, he was a genius with the newspaper reports, he gave them a suite, he gave them all the

booze they needed, he gave them food, everything - played cards - and he gave them the story. And they called their office and there was only one side - actually, it was true, for three or four days, there was only one side of the story. After awhile the employers would interject about the kidnapping and the Federal situation

But actually - and so that in a sense is his genius, in publicity. It made, it really made the organization. Going back now to 1936 or 1937 - I think - just about the beginning of 1937. So what takes place is that Jerry Horan dies. Just like the snap of your fingers he dies, Scalese is going to Chicago, takes Bambrick with him, had a meeting of the Executive Board. Jerry Horan was just buried. Who was the International president? George Scalese. Now here, a week before that or a few days before that we'd been saying we had nothing to do and now he's the International president. But (he's gonna do it?) He's going to (recognize?) them or not. Well now, he began to exercise his power - in a very subtle sort of a way - but nevertheless, coming in there I began to get into some difficulties with people. They were giving me the silent treatment and so on. So I decided I'd move out and in April of 1937, I left the organization. And Charlie Levy had gone

to Pittsburgh before that. In the meantime, Scalese was putting heat on me in a sense because Charlie Levy went to Pittsburgh and Scalese (was going?) to send me to Boston to organize in Boston. Now there were some problems there and I don't want to get involved because I know Charlie felt pretty bad because they brought him in here to testify. But Scalese had some way of maneuvering. When you were up there he gave you a salary but he gave you some leeway wherever you had to - (to get it back?). Now Scalese, when he was indicted, , he was not indicted for coercion, he was indicted for embezzlement of funds. But all these all other parts of indictments came up - but I'm getting a little bit ahead of the story - then in 1937 I decided I - some sickness in my family, my girl had scarlet fever and wasn't getting along too well so I decided to leave and I went to work as an organizer and went to work in the field because I was going to try to crush this thing which I attempted to do. But then they had an election in 1938 in which of course I was defeated, there was no question about it. But then the investigation was on pretty hot and heavy. Then I was offered 32J, which was a dormant organization. I was offered a job there

as the vice president and business manager. And I saw these people - in the meantime - these women who worked for these office buildings, as people - If I may say - this is not sob story - just like my mother. I remember first seeing them in the building at 342 Madison Avenue, called the Canadian-Pacific Building, and I saw this group of people coming in downstairs and they were speaking foreign languages and they wore babushkas and I remember when I was out in Montana, the same people which we called Hunkies, Bohunks, and so on and I could get part of the lingo and I even said, what are these people doing here? And that shows how much I knew about that part of it. I knew the front part of it but didn't really know the internal structure. Then he told me that they were cleaning women and they did the housekeeping job in the office building. But later on I began to see that these people were shoved to one side. Everytime there was a negotiation they'd call them the scrubbies. "What'll we give them?" So they gave them, as they say in Jewish, ghornish, nothing. So that I was interested in this particular part of the organization, feeling that I was going to have some free rein in respect to where I was because

I unfortunately, with all my other activities, I had got myself hemmed in by a group of people plus those inside who were vying for power, that I was looked at with a little bit of askance (end of tape)

TAPE # 24.1

QUESTION: You were telling me about the cleaning women that you would see going into these buildings....

ANSWER: Yes, well I think I said that I was offered a position in 32J which really didn't have any members. There was a charter that was given and it was given to one of the brothers of one of the clique by George Scalese. Actually - a fellow by the name of Louis Schwartz. In my estimation Louis Schwartz was not a bad fellow. He wasn't really motivated about doing a lot of work.

QUESTION: Schwartz? Louis Schwartz?

ANSWER: Yes, Louis Schwartz. But his brothers were pretty active in this whole thing, as later will be pointed out. But at the point when I went there I wasn't aware of all that was - I had mentioned before that we had shut off the thing with George Scalese and so on and so forth. But then when he became the power, I wasn't aware of all the areas in which they were carrying on their

shenanigans, their conspiracies, or whatever you want to call it. So that I went in there and the organization really had nothing. As I said before, if I go in I want to be the - I'd want to be the - I'd take the office of the vice president and business manager. Because I wanted at least a free rein to organize and do what I choose. And to some degree, at the beginning, I had. Then I began to realize that I was beginning to be ^a respectable front. Just from which they could, from behind they could carry on a conspiracy. certain times when I would organize jobs and I would find that something would happen. But nevertheless, in 1940 George Scalese was indicted and who were the first people to become state witnesses? The bag man, Izzie Schwartz, the brother of Louis Schwartz, who had been the bag man all the time, who had been the wheeler and dealer. And also his brother Louis, who was the president of 32J. And so during that period of time they were state witnesses. But I kept on organizing and they behaved themselves to some degree. Of course it was a drawback because this whole problem was taking place and many of these former persons (sic) that were giving me the push-around, so to speak, they got indicted too.

Actually, I never testified against anybody and I never squealed on anybody because because actually, in those areas I never knew any situation because I never would get involved with them. But the other parts, when I was questioned by the district attorney about certain areas which they had squealed, they said well I did, I put the bombs, the stench bombs in there. And they did that. So I said, well look, if you want to fine me, indict me, for such things, I said that's your privilege. I'm not going to tell you yes or no, that I did it or did not do it. But if I did do it, I didn't do it for the purpose of extorting any money from anybody. I did it for the purpose of trying to better the conditions of the workmen. So let's rest on that. Well to be frank with you, they didn't bother. So they - but the situation went to a point after Scalese was indicted, and this is a story which is not easy to tell, but there is some evidence of truth and some of the people are dead so it's really not - but then there's some court records on it. After Scalese became indicted in 1940 then McPetridge became the International President. And so then the district attorney, as I am told, and there are some records to prove this, after they got all through pushing

out Scalese they wanted to then take over the union as the union's counsel. Now at that time Dewey was governor of the state and Dewey was presidential timbre. He was going to run for office. There's the basic of some proof which I have that is about a guy became involved in an accident. Horowitz then conspired with Schwartz to find ways to get rid of Eddie McGuire, who was (the counsel?) and to get rid of Jim Bambrick. They went through a series of activities and they took one man who was involved in this situation, who's still alive today, and they gave him a superseding indictment and they gave him ten years. He was indicted on all ten counts of extortion and he got ten years. After that they got him to make certain statements in regard to Eddie McGuire on some of the cases we had, rough cases we had in the old days of the strike and so on. So they forced Eddie to get out and Bambrick was supposed to resign because in this whole thing they tried to tie Bambrick to some degree with a money transaction with George Scalese. Now they took another lesser man who was the secretary-treasurer of 32B who was in this transaction and instead of indicting him, they - first they had - and it's true that they came to me and they asked me to force issues and become president

of 32B. But I didn't want to take the issue against Bambrick because I felt Jim Bambrick was a good man. You know I may have had certain differences with him at certain times. I thought he was a good man, he was an honest man and he set up the organization, he didn't make himself rich and there are no signs that he ever even had - he always had a house on Park, he was a printer, he worked day and night as a printer. He was always busy in activity before - and so that he really did not - wasn't operating for money. So if he got into any difficulties within there, in any transactions, it was because of the fact he was doing it, I think, for the best interests of the union. I'm sure he was not feathering his own nest. (unintelligible comment) Anyhow, Bambrick, as I understand, the story was to just resign and he would be guilty to a misdemeanor and then he would come back to the union, publicity man, the union journal - as a matter of fact, I can show you some of the old journals that he put out. I didn't bring them with me. Maybe I should have but I felt that these old journals are, as he put them out and everything else and he built up the people who became his enemies - to some degree - and there's their pictures and of course they're the people who

(will?) take the great authority today. So anyhow, Bambrick resigned he pleaded guilty but apparently he pleaded guilty to a felony. Therefore, he got a year and he had to serve the full year. In the meantime - then Sullivan became the president. He was the secretary-treasurer; at that time Harckham was the recording secretary; Young was the vice president and Bambrick was president and Sullivan was secretary-treasurer. So what they did there was to take - Harckham went up from recording secretary to secretary-treasurer and Sullivan went as the president. Tom Shortman became the vice president and Young went back to recording secretary. He later got his vice presidency back. And then I sued, with some other people - we sued the attorney. It came out - the important thing was that the attorney that prosecuted - the prosecutor in the district attorney's office came up and became the attorney for Local 32B.

QUESTION: Horowitz?

ANSWER: Vic Horowitz. When we sued Horowitz on a conspiracy basis he went into the army. The war came and he went into the army. And the case was on the calendar. And just to finish this up, crystalize - but I won't go into all the nasty details - but then, when he went into the army, Aaron Beninson(?) came in, who was in the rackets bureau. In the meantime, a feud started to develop

between McFetridge and Dave Sullivan because - may the Lord rest both of them - but the fact was, when Horowitz went to Dewey to do - to get this thing - he said to Dewey, "If we get control of 32B then we will be able to take over the International. And on that basis you'll have people in every labor body throughout the city. You won't be considered - you're getting now to be considered as a union buster, which you will elevate your position for the presidency of the United States. If we can do this." And apparently it was agreed. And there are some facts in respect to that. So now, because - (when he took this action?), he went in there and Beninson came in, somebody started to move against McFetridge. It became very obvious. And it's a matter of record there in the Executive Board, I think they'll be found if they're necessary. And again, these men are dead and not supposed to - not necessarily to degrade them - but the fact is that McFetridge came to the Board when this heat with Scalese and all, this other thing and the Chicago racketeering and so on. And he said to the Executive Board that he wanted -- the International president job paid \$20,000 - and McFetridge at that time, from Local 1 as president, was getting \$20,000. McFetridge was also in politics.

He was a Park Commissioner and a few other things. So he said he wanted to reduce his salary to \$10,000 as an International president because he felt that this gave him a bad image. He wanted to keep Local 1, he was then going to leave Local 1, because the presidency of the International was there but - so he was going to reduce his salary. So the story was and I know there is proof of that too. Maybe peoples' memories are short but my memory is not that short. But Sullivan said well, there's no need of your reducing your salary and this and that and so on and so forth. He said, well I'm going to reduce it. So then he said "Well, we the Executive Board" - Sullivan was a man who (was in charge of the treasury?) - something tricky going on. So he said well the Executive Board will reduce the salary and I'll make a motion that the Executive Board reduce the president's salary from \$20,000 to \$10,000. It was seconded by Tom Shortman, who was a friend of mine by the way, most of our lives even if (we feuded?) but I liked Tom and we got along very well. So what took place was. McFetridge said look, "I'm doing this, on a voluntary basis. No Executive Board is going - I don't want publicity that the Executive Board came and reduced my salary. So I suggest that you withdraw

the motion." So he says "I'm not going to withdraw it". So then McPetridge put the motion - nobody voted for it but Sullivan and Shortman. So now the fat was in the fire. So then there was some action taken here in New York with respect to putting those fellows in their place. Well as a result of this whole thing - records were - charges were made against Sullivan and then they were found guilty and eventually, in the International Union there was an election - I ran in an election against Sullivan - which involved almost 10,000 votes and out of this 10,000 vote there was about 600 - the record will show - I was looking for that damed record last night. There was only about 600-700 votes between us.

QUESTION: What year was that?

ANSWER: This was in 1944. Now we're way up to....

QUESTION: This for the presidency?

ANSWER: No, it's 1945. It's January 30, 1945 because that election was supposed to be in September of 1944 and this was the election year but we were able to get the election postponed by court action until the January of 1945, January 30, 1945. Now there was an odd thing about this election. We had attorneys inside and there was an agreement which

not reduced to writing but the agreement was a verbal one, that there would be registrations and identifications. Well, so on that basis - that's the way we agreed on the basis of having the election. Now there was another thing that was wrong because the election hall was rented, it was the (Palm Garden?), over on 52nd Street and 8th Avenue and it's not a very big auditorium and so if there were lines, people would be put outside. So I suggested we take the Madison Square Garden because even the cost factor was \$4,000. Of course in those days it sounded like a lot but they didn't do it, they went along with the Palm Garden. So when we came to around about 5:30 at night it was cold, in January, and there was a lot of people lined up. And they were hollering and screaming so the appointed people - one was a fellow from the - fellow by the name of Ed Kelley from the state Labor Relations Board, not from the National Labor Relations Board. And also a fellow by the name of Goldberg, and a court-appointed man by the name of Payne. Well then they took off the registration and identification and we got into quite a hassle and then my attorney said don't do anything because they can't change the rules in the middle of the game and so on

and so on because if you do anything you're (accused?) as a Chicago mobster right now and all the other things that go with it. So the result was that we lost... - then they put it back on after 8:15, something like that and 3800 people went through the polls. I'm not yelling sour grapes but I happen to know a little something about these things. But anyway, that - and we made a protest of this election. But then because of the date, and because of the big vote of the opposition - and if I have anything to complain of McFetridge, it was that they got a little cocky because then they said, now we have a big opposition because of the 10,000 vote and there was only about 600 between. There's a hell of an opposition. So instead of looking at the protest of the election and following through on that basis, they had an Executive Board meeting in March, I think it was the third or fourth day of March, something like that, in 1945. And see, in February there was only twenty-eight days and this was January 30th and so you see there was this short month between so the International - (I have a record somewhere, I'll find it. In other words, I had let things go until late -) suspended Sullivan. Prior to that they had

a trial all kinds of
charges and things....

QUESTION: These charges, what kind of charges?

ANSWER: Well the charges were conspiracy, the one with Horowitz. The other charges were certain expenditures. The other charges were malfeasance because certain people testified or made affidavits, some of them didn't show up to swear to their affidavits because there were a lot of other intrigues because people got together, people who are alive today, where they were on one side today, they were on the other side tomorrow, and so on. But anyway, we had this trial, this charge trial, in September of 1944 - or before September, I think it was like - the nomination was September 8th 1944, so it was probably 30 days, 40 days before this nomination was coming up. And on that basis they - Sullivan got an injunction against them, restraining them from making a decision and this injunction had never been heard all this time it was going on so that's why the election was postponed over to January 30, 1945. So then, getting back to March of 1945, on the basis of these charges and all the other things, they (acted upon them?) and they found him guilty and they suspended him as the president of 32B, member of 32B and the vice

president of the International Union. And he sent out a telegram to everybody. It's a matter of record, just something... not

just show you what politics

So that now Sullivan went into court and he asked that they be restrained etc., and so on and so forth. So all these things that went on in April of 1945 or May of 1945 - (and this is in the law journal too?). I didn't even look up the archives but that's on record in there. A whole big story of it. They ruled against the International and said they had no right even though the constitution..... Because the International did not exhaust their powers but in the local constitution they just took the authority that they had under the constitution, which didn't, apparently, agree with the judge. And that Sullivan was - he couldn't suspend him as president of 32B because he was elected. You see, they never even carried through on the protest of the election. But said he was elected by 5,000, so many people. I think it's 5300, in respect to - by the membership and therefore he was in office and he had the right only to suspend him as an International vice president, but not a member of the International Union and as

as president . It's a very long piece and many times I intended to go back - I've lost it somewhere - and see in the archives of the law journal somewhere if you want to look for it and - it should be roughly in May or June of 1945. Now the war was on and we couldn't get a convention and this is where we go back to the other situation. Now you see, there was two big divisions taking place there because McFetridge had already put the fat in the fire and he lost within the court. (and I remember?) very distinctly because of the politics because Roosevelt was elected but he died in May of 1945 and of course that seemed that there were some reason in the areas that they didn't have the political clout that they really needed. It didn't come down from the top. Anyhow, then there were questions of this situation of McFetridge's action which was upset by the court. So that put him perhaps in a bad light and it put Sullivan not in the best of light. And I don't even know whether I should be saying on tape but this is part of the political operations. But nevertheless, the war was over the convention was held I think, somewhere in October. The records are there, of 1945. And at

that time there was a delegation of people who... see, under the constitution at that particular time you had to elect the delegates to the convention. So we who were the rebels, we were known as the rebels, had set up - when we saw what happened in the other elections - but we had set up candidates for the International convention. And of course they were all defeated. Well we took them to Chicago and they - the convention was out in Chicago - and they were - we were asking for credentials - that they be seated and recognized and so on. Well, what happened was that when we got there they didn't want to seat them (at the beginning?) So finally, on the motion of a majority, with George Fairchild, he ruled that they should be seated and that they be given equal votes. There's a record on it, you can look it up. So then there came a dispute. I don't recall now, all the speeches I think are in the convention record. I'm sure I've got that stashed away somewhere. But it must be amongst the archives.

QUESTION: We have the convention proceedings.

ANSWER: You have that. O.k., the one delegate who said about "why are we voting?" That was me. Because he had started calling the roll and they weren't answering yes or nay - if you'll notice in that

Well the result was - then I don't have to tell you about it, it's in the record. And so on that basis it was neutralized. So when this was finished, McPetridge got us together - McPetridge was a guy who didn't have to tell you very much - I used to (call?) him the monk because he'd maybe say half a dozen words to you and he could convey it in such a manner that you clearly understood. So he said at the - we had a man on our side who made a speech and of course they hurt themselves, which is an interesting part of what took place. First of all, this type of procedure has been copied later in political conventions, sending a rebel delegation, but this was the - and I may say that I was the architect of that and I'll plead guilty because... But anyway, and we were kind of shaky in respect to our grounds.

QUESTION: How many - of this rebel group, how many were you?

ANSWER: Well we had, as I say, at the election there was - I'm not quite - I think the vote runs like this, there were about 600 or 700 between us so it was almost, just short of 10,000. So I think I got 4600 votes and he got 5300. As a matter of fact, I think in the court record they raised it up just a little bit. You know, threw in a few other.... But the fact that -

that was the difference and our votes were legit. See, we were not packed. And you're not going to say well, there's ^{ruins} were illegit or not. But you would see that there's a very small division between us, in the percentage of votes - well we were running about 48 or something like that. I forget the percentage at this moment. But the fact was - that answers your question, how many were we. So that we had this great opposition and I said before, because there was this type of opposition, if ^{had} they/followed a different procedure then they may not have had this court battle. But because they went through a - they received a big opposition, they felt that they had the power because all they had to do was come back in and say well the election, on the basis of protests and so on, we're going to have another election and then put in proper procedures, the same procedures, and see what would take place. There may be other reasons, I don't know. I suspect what they were but we're not going to get into that. That's only purely suspicion. But the fact was that after this vote on the floor, by roll call, McFetridge simply said to me - oh, one of the leaders was a fellow by the name of Lynch (end of side 1)

24.2

QUESTION:

You were telling me about Lynch.

ANSWER:

Yeah. Well Lynch was the candidate, Chris Lynch, candidate on our ticket. I think we withdrew him not to have opposition. Yes, we did. Not to have opposition against Harckham. Because this was one of the things.... We didn't put anybody against Harckham. Because Harckham was in a neutral position. After we we set up our nominations there was a request that we withdraw - we had a lot of problems and argument about it but the fact was that we decided not to attack everybody. (Just so?) we had one particular target. Anyhow, I'm talking about the election now. So Lynch was in a sense the leader, or partly the leader, the man in the forefront, as well as myself and I got in that position because I was somewhat in the background. But he - when we - when this thing got - when this thing came on the floor, the question of the minority report was submitted by the chairman, a fellow by the name of Carroll, Ray Carroll from Detroit, who had been the chairman of the credentials committee and someone else and they made a minority report, / ^{wanted} to reject it. Then George Fairchild with the majority report wanted to accept it. And this was the decision. Now they start the whole big route. And this is the thing where sometimes a procedure is going to lose for you or give people basis for losing. Because immediately -

32B was a big tremendous delegation. They started to yell and shout and get up on the floor and say - started calling names and all this and that and McFetridge said "I'm running this convention." They started - and I think the record will show this - until finally there was utter turmoil. And so George, Pop Hardy, Charlie, he gets up on the floor. Now we didn't know which way he was going to go. He said look, he said, "I respect 32B but I'm going to be against them if they carry on this type of procedure." Now I don't know whether that's in the record or not. But I think it - ... if they carry on this type of procedure because we want to have a peaceful convention if possible. Now, this was the key because after this was settled down and they said well all right, we're going to have a roll call and each side will be allowed to pick one speaker. Each speaker would be given - a minute, six minutes - and present their side and then we'll put it to a vote. So we took Chris because he was a good speaker, because don't forget, I'm a delegate to another organization. So I said, now Chris, get your things together. So we had to get from - when we adjourned let's say at 12:15 to 2:00 when our

speech was. So o.k., it was a simple matter because they gave us the basis. And the basis was that the row they started there, that we had no voice and which was somewhat true. It was not a fact because they began to have the - not real democracy - a whole clique so if anybody spoke in opposition he was quietly moved out. And so on that basis we said there's part of it Chris - I think his speech is in there - as the demonstration took place. We've always had this, wherever we go within our organization, we're not allowed to say anything because they overwhelm us, as they did here this morning. Another thing, we came here with nickels and dimes and quarters, and so on. So that's how we framed the speech and then of course the vote shows for itself. Well after that, after that was over, then there was a whole thing because what was 32B going to do? Were they going to withdraw from the International? Their power? A number of things. So McFetridge said to me after the vote and in the afternoon - the next day as a matter of fact - he said - in the morning, when everything was sort of calmed down, the business was over. He said "I want to see you and Chris Lynch. I'm inviting you,

Sullivan and Shortman." I said "What is this?" "Well" he said, "I want to talk." O.K. Now I'm the kind of a guy that can understand certain things. Chris was not so happy and neither was our other following and it was a pretty rough thing. Well there was a lot of publicity thrown back and forth. And incidentally, I may say, in this whole melee, Bambrick got out of jail. He served his term and he was out. And what he had suggested, that the agreement that they had made with him, was not lived up to. And so he was very bitter, very bitter. So he put out all kinds of propaganda. Then he brought in people who in a sense were not involved. Like guys came to me "Oh, I know you, you were bad guys." And I said gee whiz, stop, why is he bringing these hoods in? No doubt they were bad hoodlums and what have they got to do with the thing between us and them. But anyway, he had got off on a tangent and he really had made - I don't even think they would have been able to put enough votes across regardless, except Jim - they used them and they started to use him. Here's a guy who had done things and he was just making a complaint and they had ammunition against him because he was so vitriolic. Anyway, the result was that we met. And, well, when I got on the elevator - and I didn't

know what the hell it was all about. When who gets on, as a coincidence, Ed Sullivan and Tom Shortman. I said hello - and I didn't even know they were going to be because he didn't - I don't think he said to me that we - we were just going to talk. So when I get up there I see that a waiter had brought in the trays to eat - tables - I said what is this? A love feast Bill? And he said "no, no, he said it's not a love feast. We'll discuss." O.K. then, it was simple and came to a certain thing, he said "it's very simple. Look, we've been feuding. There have been problems here and if we keep this up we're not doing the job we're supposed to do. Now I suggest that you fellows get together." Etc. In the meantime I was beginning to have some problems in 32J because these guys - as a matter of fact, they tried to give me a beating. That's a story in itself. But it didn't work out, they weren't that successful. And that caused me to get very angry. See before I wasn't too angry at Louis and I sort of liked the guy. I knew his brother and he was dominated by his brother. But then that caused me to get angry. I said, well you're finished. If you can be tough, I can be tough too. So the result was that I had certain actions going there too, at the same time. As a matter of fact, the very same day I had got the

court order on the basis that I was president of the union, 32J, but on that basis we - well we didn't have an absolute agreement. He said let's see if we can try to smooth things over. Now I saw that the attorneys and other people had discussions behind the scene and once they approached - and I'm not saying that there wasn't - but that to me was a reasonable thing because feuds can't go on and on forever. But I knew that I had some very tough fellows in my group who were very thick headed and Irish, thick as can be. Even thicker than I am. And one fellow, Lord bless him, is dying today. A little tough character. But he - and it wasn't easy to create a peace. So we just exchanged a few things. First thing, tried to stop the publicity - try to let off heat - take the heat off - we agreed. Then we got together and we set up organization committees and so on. But that was the end of that part of the history. And then later on, some years later, this was 1950 - and we proceeded with our organization, I proceeded with - I got rid of those people there and 32B got rid of their complaints and we proceeded to go along and we got along pretty good over the years. Finally, Benderson became our attorney. We straightened the things out but here and there a little (rough?).

But then as for the International situation, this is just to finish that out, was maybe a few fragments, but I think as time went on, in 1954 - I guess it was '54 - it was probably '55 - the fall of '54, that Bill Cooper was the president, our secretary-treasurer, who had elected in 1940, he died and we went out to Milwaukee to the funeral and then George Fairchild became the secretary-treasurer and then later on - I think another five years went by, 1960, Sullivan became president. Then later on they got into a feud, a private feud amongst themselves, McFetridge and Sullivan and George Fairchild. It was over the marina - but anyway, Sullivan had done a number of good things and one of the things I guess that gave him a lot of prestige, a lot of votes, was the International pension. Because everybody who was in these trades didn't really have much - you could work all your life, maybe for a salary and there would be no basics of where you would go, outside of - So that takes care of that whole smear, the ups and downs are matters of record. Then getting back to my own status, one thing I wanted to mention and which has skipped my mind - well I said during these periods we finally decided it was best to try to work together. And there were some areas in which perhaps - I had

even wanted to merge at one time. Then after Sullivan became International President he didn't want the merger. George said to me they wouldn't merge because you couldn't get along with them. But I said not so, they couldn't get along with me because - well I'm not downgrading the job he did, I think he did a pretty good job, but I think there were a lot of areas we could have straightened out which were not in a sense done. But I think we made fairly good progress, by and large. Our situation of course now seems for the future pretty well with the merger and I would think it will be a much stronger organization regardless of the fact that we got a bad economy and so on but the future of the building service in these two groups looks well and I wouldn't be surprised if other people may either link closer or get tighter to the organization. I think that I'd rather - 32J speaks for itself. When it started in there / was nothing there. When they left - when I finally got rid of them, there was \$14,500 in debt which I had to pay off. And I had about twenty - in all of it around that period of time, 1900 members so we reached a peak of some 15,000. And we have stronger contracts in our agreements than other unions throughout the country. That's related - particularly

the successor clause which is going to be one of the battles that will take place here. We have a - particularly with the maintenance contract. We have also with the employers a clause and we're the first one to introduce it, the subcontract. And the reason this is very vital to the welfare of the people. You see, if you have maintenance contractors coming in on a job and each time they come on a job they're allowed to change the crew, then a person never gets any tenure, never gets any seniority. Now we, with all the maintenance, have the standard contract, if they take over a job from another person, they're going to take the people. That'll maintain their seniority. We have the other clause which is pretty tough, that they can't change the work schedule unless they get the written consent of the union. We have in the subcontracting clause of the RAB the clause that says that your - if you're a subcontractor you must get the written consent of the union before you can change the work schedule. Now these are very protective clauses for the members and as a matter of fact, they should be adopted all the time and it's legal. Some try to say well you can't force the incoming contractor - you can't stop free enterprise. But this is not so. It's been contested a number of

times. I consider myself pretty much of a secondary expert. Let's put it this way, a first class one. If you can put experts in categories. In these particular things. Because I've lived the experience of many times you have a job and the contractor takes it for one year and the next year, boom, a new contractor comes in. This happens all over the nation. As a matter of fact, I submitted - I think they've submitted a bill in Congress asking to - I wrote to them them, it's a matter of record, of having us exempt under certain sections of the law because, how do you protect the worker in this competitive competition unless you have the right to picket? And this is on the basis of a secondary picket because you're picketing the contractor they say you can't picket only on his site - a lot of things. So that speaking of looking back over the years, certainly the Service Employees Union both in the International it's made great progress. And I must say because George Hardy himself, I have great respect for because he's a fellow that I see as a workhorse. And a great portion of his time is devoted to the union - whatever phase it may be and he might make a mistake here and there or might be over zealous in some places, something like that, but he's always looking for

progress, for benefits. And on that basis I would say that there's going to be problems because of certain economies and certain strong positions, they have anti-union employers and those who are not really anti or against the supply the capitol and so forth and we're going to probably have a period of time which things are going to be maybe a little rough but looking back again, and I just repeat, that I think the Service Employees, despite all these little side issues and things I talked about, has made tremendous strides. And will make further.... Now if there are any other questions, shoot, I can't - I'm talked out now. I don't even know really if that's the right sequence or if that's the thing you want.

QUESTION: You've given me a good idea, particularly of the years, like I said, 1938 to 1940 when we don't have much at the International in the way of records. A lot of those things were destroyed for one reason or another and so you've filled in some of the gaps. I'd like to go back to a couple things. One is, you talked about when Scalese had moved in, had he wanted you to go up to Boston?

ANSWER: Oh, yes.

QUESTION: Did he want Charlie Levy to go to Pittsburgh or....

ANSWER: Oh, Charlie Levy had gone to Pittsburgh. Charlie had - this one I didn't show you here - but this letter, I'll give you copies - when we got into this - in 1937 when we were getting into the problems of things, but Charlie went to Pittsburgh I think - let's see, I've got a letter here - he went May 23, 1937. That's when he wrote me this letter. Well he had been in Pittsburgh just a short period of time as the letter will show. Well it was shortly after this that Scalese suggested to me that maybe I should go to Boston. I was having these problems, as I said, internally, with the fellows that I grew up with and I see certain areas in which they're going and, as a matter of fact, at one time they sort of suggested to me that I should be part of their group who worked together and so on.

QUESTION: Was this like a racket?

ANSWER: Well, I guess when you say - here was the story - and the story became quite simple - was as I repeated before, that if you wanted to change the classification then somebody would approach you and say here is such a case and we have something for you and just - they handled it and that's the way it was. So it was. And that's how they all got - out of this came - aside from Scalese and the two Schwartz's, his two henchmen,

then came within the organization of 32B and there again Bambrick hurt himself too because he was loyal to these people and I don't think that he certainly was in part of this operation. I think each one individually played his own game. There may have been some areas in which I learned that he was giving them some extra expense money but not kicking back. Because they were claiming they wanted an increase in salary and he'd say well I'll give you.... - but the fact was, five indictments besides Bambrick and besides Scalese and his two henchmen and these were fellows who were prominent men within the organization and one of them I think personally was just sucked in there, a guy who I know very well, and he died. I think something may have happened to him, he just went out and got drunk and they found him laying in the gutter. He finally died in the hospital. You can take that either way you want to because he was not going to be involved with the group. Or at least that's what he told me. And he was just going to go there and throw himself on the mercy of the court and that was the end of that. He didn't get the opportunity. So the other things was - that. And of course, naturally, when this thing was taking place if you said anything - see, at one time, as I mentioned

to you before, we were all together before he became the president. In cutting our ties with the International. But then when he became the power why, people fall easy to power and then after that, when (they fell to the power?) there were sort of certain things that took place. And as a matter of fact, there were other things I assume and I know, but because of the political situation in the district attorney's office, you could see that they wanted to control. I mean you don't have to see the prosecutor in the DA's office, the prosecutor finally becomes the counsel to the union, well you look at this with sort of askance anyhow. Aside from anything else. So that - but what else?

QUESTION: So you think Bambrick was kind of - he was afraid of these people but that he really didn't do anything....

ANSWER: Well you see, there was a situation at one time when Bambrick was fighting. Now Harckham got hit but the question is, did they hit Harckham and make a mistake for Bambrick? Because Bambrick lived in Ozone Park in his own house there which he had built himself, put part of his work into it, and when it was first developed, which goes back quite a few years, and then Harckham didn't live too far away.

So what would take place is that Harkcham would come over to Bambrick's house and they would come in to work together. So this particular - whatever was taking place in pushing within because he had a doctor and an employment agency he rigged and so on, I think, whatever was taking place, somebody came to the door of Bambrick's house, rang the bell, Harckham went to the door and they just slugged him and that was it. Well that was one thing that created a situation of fear. The other was - I remember saying to Jim, and I (won't?) say this very boastfully because I mentioned before, as to my attitude towards these people in respect to his, but I lay it that I think back if I was his age, 46, and I was 29, it would seem to me that thinking is different. But I had said to him, "look Jim, forget about these guys, don't worry about it. We can watch out for you." And so on and so forth. Because he had told me, "well, from what they've told me, they're gonna have me floating down the river." And so on and so forth. So I said "Why do you tolerate them? They have no right to shine your shoes." That's the way I felt about him as an organization man. He - and I think he must have got - I can't understand - I used to say to him afterwards,

"Jim, why did you plead guilty? I can't understand it Jim." I said "Please, stay in the back a little bit. You've pleaded guilty to a felony. I don't want to be too sharp but, or too heavyhanded, but why did you plead?" And his answer to me was that he was told that he was not going to plead - that he was to plead misdemeanor and he couldn't understand why - that Eddie McGuire, although he thought a great deal of him, he said, how this thing came about. Because Dewey himself came into the court that day, at the time Bambrick got sentenced. So Bambrick said he wanted to make a statement in the court and the judge said no, you can't make no statement. Which is, I think, absolutely out of order. Because what he said he was trying to do was complain that he was not pleading to a misdemeanor. That was his statement - or to a felony - and the fact was a misdemeanor was just as simple in a sense as it was that he was not going to - he was just going to take it. That way it would take the heat off and he would come back later on. Now there's all kinds of circulars and all things spread about all the whole situation and he wrote a book. Incidentally, the book apparently was picked up. I had a copy of it and somebody borrowed it from me and I never saw it again.

QUESTION: We have a copy of it. We found one....

ANSWER: You have. And so that - but what took place before he published this book - I mean put it on the market - there was some arrangement made but unfortunately, he was a brokenhearted man and he didn't live that long after. He didn't live very much - after the convention he was very brokenhearted because - well we had that convention in 1945 - of what took place. He was there and he wanted people to talk to McFetridge and McFetridge refused to see him and he felt in a sense that this was a let-down because, in a sense, for the attack upon Sullivan, McFetridge used him to have this part of the attack on Sullivan because this was all part of a package situation but McFetridge didn't want to come to the front in those issues and - well there were other people who approached me to make an affidavit -

a lot of stories but this looks like I would be talking in terms of you know, self-serving of myself. But I realize that Izzie Schwartz - see, one of the reasons Izzie Schwartz - because of his conspiracy actions, Izzie Schwartz, when he became a state witness, and to his brother - Well, as a matter of fact I've got something there on that. read it now, unless you want to

question it. Izzie Schwartz had been a state witness and (in light of that?) he was promised immunity and then when he got to a point where Horowitz came in the office - when Horowitz came in office, he refused to see Schwartz and Izzie - when the DA who took Horowitz's place, or was in on the case, a fellow by the name of Moore (end of tape)

25.1

QUESTION: You were telling me about Izzie Schwartz.

ANSWER: When Izzie Schwartz went down to the DA - this was his story to me - he was promised immunity and (the fellow?) said "well have Horowitz come down here and tell us this. ^{If} /we in this office made a commitment to somebody, or indicated to somebody, we'll honor it. But on the other hand, he has to come down here and say it." And apparently Horowitz refused to do this. So when all this action was set up here by a certain person in this city who made me the, sort of the leader in the sense of this rebellion, there was other people who had joined in, such as Izzie Schwartz on the basis of the conspiracy and some other things which were on the basis of financial situations. But I said to Izzie at the beginning, "Now if I take this situation" (which is outlined by certain people who are alive today) "then I'm not

going to change because if I'm sure that I read it, that if you get - if we start this, they're going to promise you all kinds of things." Which they did. When I said "they're" I meant those in charge and he said "Oh, no, no, no." I said don't come to me. Well one day he came to me and he said " they called me down there and they said well all right, we're going to change the whole thing. We're going to go down but you have to take Perry and you have to convert him. Not only do you have to convert him, but we want to solidify a position whereby if you make an affidavit against McFetridge that there's a conspiracy going on here, or whatever there is that he is the leader, then we'll throw him out and we'll make Perry our vice-president." And I said no, I can't do that. As a matter of fact, I made an affidavit for Bill. I've got a copy someplace. I know very well he has - or did - amongst his papers. I said, Look, I'm not going to do it. And in fact, he took me into a place, a vacant office space where they had their - a vacant space adjacent to where they had their offices. And back and forth, some threats and some attempts at bribery, and so on. I said, look, this is a simple thing. He said, "You want me to go to jail? Or my brother to go to jail?" I said no. And I said, you

don't have to go to jail. Because this is a simple thing. You don't have to pay him - pay them twice. You paid them already once. You more than paid them. So you just go down and tell them look, I paid you once and that's my answer. And tell them that I said so. Do you think I have to get paid four or five times for one act? So let them suffer. So on that basis he went down and he gave them the - what the heck's the date here - this is June 17, 1944. You can see it ties in with ^{the} election coming up in September. So he gave - I said after he gives it to you, I said then we'll decide who's what. What the hell, I said, so if you say this then you're gonna do something else. He's that kind of a guy. I (he?) said you're a thief, you're a racketeer. What is he? There's no difference. And I don't wear no halos either but I just think - how do we balance the scales? And on that basis, that took place. So he came by one time and he said well it worked, it worked out all right. But, it probably was a little bit later when I lost the - when I didn't quite make the election. Well it was all right because that was held in abeyance. But after the court record came down in May of 1944 or thereabouts, the judgment, then they started to put the heat on me, feel real hate and as I said, that's when we had the parting of the ways and of course - I mean with his brother Louis.

I said Louis, don't listen to your brother. I said we've got to change around. You're going to be the secretary-treasurer, o.k. I'm not gonna get involved and live through a whole hell of a lot of stuff with this whole area going through from both sides. And all(?) the past ten years but I'm certainly not going to allow you to have somebody attack me personally. He said "we didn't do it." I said you're a liar. You lie. It's an out and out lie. And I don't want to go through how it was set up and I said, just lucky, if I didn't get under that desk, or table, there was a table there, and I know a little about in-fighting, I said I would have been out the window probably. And so I dived under the table. I figured I'd get myself in position because he had at me and this guy - in talking to Louis and he called me in, into his office and then this guy immediately attacked me. So on that basis, well then I grabbed the guy's foot but then he ran. So I have newspaper clippings of that too. I don't know where they are. Maybe they're destroyed for all I know. I think my wife threw them out because she was kind of annoyed one time with all this always afraid and she had reasons to be afraid, I guess, because they sent me - you know what used to come to

my house during this whole period of time? Once they sent a coffin, a little guy in a miniature coffin, a necktie, and it looked like me. And they used to make phone calls, they send a load to trees to deliver to my house, they sent some fertilizer, and all kinds of stuff. They even sent to the office, and I don't even know how they got to do this - a C.O.D. order of seven cases of whiskey from Macys. And I went back to - just as I was having a meeting - I was having a meeting in the office and all of a sudden came this order, timed very nice. As if I had - I had swore off drinking and didn't indulge. But they wanted to put me in that kind of a position, that my brain was rum soaked and so on. I'm going to tell you (it wasn't all just that smooth?) But they're gone. I'm here. And I'm able to say a few words. But the fact is that Izzie finally got off the hook on the basis of what I said. But then they started to move the other way, from the other side.

QUESTION: Do you want to show me what you have here or just comment on any of the things briefly?

ANSWER: Well, I have this newspaper, that's one part of my life with 32B and part of 32B because....

QUESTION: ... where you were shot at....

ANSWER: Yes, and I was five weeks in the hospital. I have but I look at them, you see,

they're not dated and the only thing that really comes up is a date that ties in with this. Then there's the one with Judge Mahoney. Looking through most of this stuff, I see that - here's something. I think I gave you that one on Bambrick starting that program.

QUESTION: Oh, the educational program?

ANSWER: Yeah. Look, I must defend Bambrick. I mean I really must. I don't think that I would like to have anybody say a bad word against him. Even though I didn't go to his funeral. Because I knew that these other people were there and I wouldn't go to the funeral. I couldn't see the hypocrisy of such - I mean, I (couldn't contain?) myself. Now this is - this thing here I was looking for a date here - well you can have it if you want to make anything out of it. It was in 1938. Well you can peruse it if you wish and see if there's anything that's worth anything. Now on these letters of Charlie Levy, I can have Lil make copies and I'll ask her to do that.

QUESTION: Maybe at some point someone could have copies made of all these things and you can send them to the International and we could keep them for our records.

ANSWER: Well this is when we made the agreement on the maintenance contractors in 1954 -- or 56. And this

what sets up the basis for the language that I've been talking about and also it's going to be a very serious thing in respect to the merged unions in respect to the fact that 32B is more or less pledged to fight for this type of language. The employers, I'm quite sure, are looking to modify it in some respects. And then again you have a problem with a negotiated agreement. Which do you take? Do you take language? Protective language? Or do you take money? And at certain times - I mean wages, I should say - and conditions. And then there are times when you take the wages, maybe is the better part of the thing. And there are times when you'll want the protective language because the wage things, or the tenure and stuff - if you don't get tenure you're in bad shape too. Seniority. Now this here - there's a date on this and you can have that if you want it. This was when I was trying to get Bambrick to amend the constitution and it/^{was sitting}(up there in the office?) But I don't condemn Jim in any manner. By and large, I suppose everything has its own place in history, good or bad.

End of tape
/mac