

**Executive
Council
Report**



43

**43rd Annual
Conference
September 24-27 1963
Scarborough**

were prepared to bring forward the starting date to August 1 but that if this were unacceptable to the Union then the offer as a whole would be withdrawn.

The matter was now squarely before the Executive Council. If the offer were now to be rejected then the only alternative was arbitration. Although the Employers' had threatened to withdraw the offer, it was fairly obvious that their proposal of 3 per cent from the end of the year would be the counter terms of reference to an Arbitration Tribunal. On the other hand, it would be difficult for the Executive Council to avoid a situation in which the Arbitration Tribunal would determine those aspects of the wage structure which had been projected into the discussions as a prepared counter balance to the Employers' possible introduction of a bi-ennial review. Yet, despite the fact that the National Association of Fire Officers had, on the Officers' Committee of the NJC, invited the Employers' to discuss bi-ennial review, *even without a wage offer at that time*, the Executive Council had managed to arrive at a position in which the Employers' were making a hard proposal without having become involved in the complexities of discussing long term reviews which would restrict the Union's future freedom of action.

The Executive Council reminded itself that at last year's Conference, it had been agreed that before "the Union enters into a major battle with the Employers", all factors, economic and political, had to be taken into account. It was those very factors which now had to be considered.

The Executive Council had to decide whether to go to arbitration, knowing full well that the whole of our claim could not escape definitive decisions one way or the other. This would mean that matters which were primarily, introduced at this stage out of tactical reasons to serve as breakwaters against the possibilities of a bi-ennial review, would be settled in these present economic and political conditions, and settled without reference to any prospect of a subsequent review. Equally they had to gauge what were the prospects of getting more and at an earlier date.

The Executive Council also had to bear in mind the prospect of political and economic changes within the next year or so. Mr. Selwyn Lloyd and the Conservative Government had attempted to hold down industrial wages by freezing those of public services. In 1961/62 the FBU had broken through this policy. We may well be on the eve of further developments in governmental and public policy concerned with wage bargaining and industrial relations. The General Election cannot be too long delayed. The Executive Council is the last to assume that a Labour Government is going to remove all restrictions from local authority employers, who are in all cases particularly sensitive to Whitehall policies. On the other hand, *in the light of the possible alternatives facing the Union this year, the Executive Council on balance decided to accept the 3 per cent from August 1 on the clear understanding that all other matters tabled by the Union remained undetermined and with the Union perfectly at liberty to return to them at any time.*

With a modest wage increase in the bag, therefore, and with complete freedom to act in the future in the light of changing "economic and political conditions", the Executive Council settled the matter at Glasgow.

The large number of congratulatory letters which the Executive Council subsequently received was a clear indication of how well understood by large groups of our members were the considerations which led to this Executive decision.

On the other hand, the younger men in particular were disappointed at the outcome of the negotiations. Their disappointment is well appreciated by the

Executive Council. Once again we have to remember that in wage negotiations nothing remains settled.

The Executive Council looks forward with interest and anticipation to the unfolding developments of the coming year.

PAY FROM AUGUST 1st, 1963

FIREMEN, LEADING FIREMEN AND SUB-OFFICERS

Year of Service	National Rate		Metropolitan excl. London		London	
	Present w.e.f. 1.1.62	New w.e.f. 1.8.63	Present w.e.f. 1.1.62	New w.e.f. 1.8.63	Present w.e.f. 1.1.62	New w.e.f. 1.8.63
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Fireman						
1st	625	*645	675	*695	710	*730
2nd	660	680	710	730	735	755
3rd	685	705	735	755	760	780
4th	710	730	760	780	785	805
5th	735	755	785	805	810	830
6th	760	785	810	835	835	860
7th	785	810	835	860	860	885
8th	810	835	860	885	885	910
9th	835	860	885	910	912	937
Leading Fireman	870	895	920	945	947	972
Sub-Officer						
1st	905	930	955	980	982	1,007
2nd	940	970	990	1,020	1,017	1,047
3rd	975	1,005	1,025	1,055	1,052	1,082

* If under 21 years of age the following rates apply:

Provinces	£620
Metropolitan	£670
London	£705

OFFICERS' PAY

Shortly after the Union's claim was submitted, NAFO unilaterally put in a claim to the Officers' Committee of the NJC for 7 per cent and a bi-ennial review. The claim indicated the degree of disunity which unhappily still exists to plague the Service today.

At a meeting of the Officers' Committee, following the Employers' total rejection of the Union's claim, the same terse reply was given to the Employees' Side in respect of the claim for officers. Regretably, the Negotiating Secretary of the Association then proceeded to argue the Association's case for a bi-ennial review.

The experiences of this last year confirm that if the Union is to stage a struggle for a further major review of Fire Service pay, a common policy for all ranks must be evolved and a firm unity throughout the Service cemented once again upon that common policy.