Monday, July 9, 1956

This is written in regard to my former complaint filed . It is my sincere belief that I am continually and grossly being discriminated against.

In 1953 I filed an application for the aircraft assembly department. This application was filed at the factory employment office. Management steadfastly insisted that this application was misplaced and that they had no knowledge that it ever existed. As recently as two months ago the factory employment manager Ernst Riskoff informed my steward, Harry Douglas, that the application had been filed but due to the new system of upgrading through Norm Holtz's office factory employment could take no action on the application.

On or about February 21, 1956 I requested my foreman to give me an upgrading application for the aircraft assembly department. My foreman, S. Salo, agreed to give me the application. I was evaluated by my foreman on these eight factors:

1. quantity of work - Good
2. quality of work - good
3. Job knowledge - good
4. attendance and punctuality - good
5. care of tools and equipment - good
6. conduct on job - good
7. ability to learn - good
8. safety - good

After marking all these factors 'Good,' in the remarks column my foreman placed a notiation which read: "This employee needs close supervision." This application was turned in to Norm Holtz's office in line with upgrading proceedures. Sometime elapsed and other employees were placed in the aircraft assembly department. When my steward investigated the reasons for which I was not upgraded he was informed that I had no application in the office. Norm Holtz gave Salo back the application because he could not accept it with the notation that my foreman had placed on it. When my steward questioned Salo on the application Salo informed my steward that he would not remove the notation. Salo was informed by the Union that Robert Jones, the labor relations director ruled in a previous case that once an employee receives an application from his foreman the employee was automatically recommended regardless of what the foreman wrote on the application.

This was a point of proceedure established by management. Salo claimed he had no previous knowledge of the proceedure and stated that there was no furthur obligation to me. The Union took the matter up with Salo's superior, Superintendent Gerry Gerrow. The Union pointed out that it was impossible for an employee to be evaluated "Good" on the eight factors and still "need close supervision." In Superintendent Gerrow's disposition he overruled Salo. Mr. Gerrow felt that foreman Salo should have given me a good recommendation or no recommendation at all. He instructed foreman Salo to re-instate my application without any notation at all. Foreman Salo informed the Union and the superintendent that he could not reinstate the application because he had misplaced it or destroyed it and could not remember which he did or what happened to the application.